



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 167

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 23, 2021

No. 109

Senate

The Senate met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Honorable JACKY ROSEN, a Senator from the State of Nevada.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Gracious God, today accept the love and loyalty of our hearts. We are grateful for Your loving kindness and tender mercies.

Lord, we desire to please You by living for Your glory. Continue to bless our lawmakers. May they seek guidance from Your holy Word, permitting sacred precepts to provide lamps for their feet and light for their path. May this light also illuminate the road ahead for others who walk in darkness, so that Your will for our Nation and world may be done.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, June 23, 2021.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable JACKY ROSEN, a Sen-

ator from the State of Nevada, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Ms. ROSEN thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

FOR THE PEOPLE ACT OF 2021

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, yesterday, the Senate was given an opportunity to begin debate on a subject that by all rights should be beyond debate: protecting the right to vote.

As we all know, Republican legislatures across the country are passing some of the most draconian restrictions on the right to vote in decades—a throwback to Jim Crow.

Every single Democrat yesterday voted to begin debate on legislation to fight back against this assault—and that is what it is, an assault on our democracy—every single one. It was the first time in this Congress that we have united all 50 Democrats on moving forward with strong and comprehensive voting rights legislation.

Senate Republicans, to the very last Member, voted against allowing the Senate to even have a debate on voting rights. Not a single Republican voted to move forward with a simple debate. In fact, the Republican leader went so far as to say that “regardless of what may be happening in some states”—voter suppression laws, phony audits, or the partisan takeover of election boards—he believes the Federal Gov-

ernment should not intervene. Who said that? Southern Senators from the Civil War all the way through said States’ rights—used as a tool to prevent particularly people of color from voting. And to invoke that in 2020? The majority leader is way off—way off base. It is disgraceful that he would even invoke that.

Yesterday’s vote was another piece of evidence that voter suppression is now part of the official platform of the Republican Party. But I want to be clear about one thing. As I said last night, the fight to protect voting rights is far, very far from over. Yesterday’s vote was the starting gun, not the finish line.

As the Senate majority leader, I reserve the right to bring up this issue for debate again. Yesterday was the first time we tried to consider major voting rights legislation, but it won’t be the last. Democrats will explore every option available to us for reconsidering legislation on this topic. We will leave no stone unturned. Voting rights are too important. The fight against modern-day voter suppression is just beginning.

One other point. Some of them like to make this point: Oh, this is just a partisan fight. Bull. This is a fight for the soul of America, and it shouldn’t be partisan, and it never was in the past. When legislatures try to prevent poor people, people of color, urban people, and young people from voting, that is not a political fight; that is what America is all about. So don’t try to hide under that guise.

It is Republican legislatures doing this. But in the past, when legislatures, usually in the South, tried to do these things—and in other places—both parties united to stop it. No more, sadly. Shame, shame, shame, shame on my Republican colleagues. This is a very bad day for them that history will recognize.

• This “bullet” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S4707

JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, now on another matter, this week, the Senate will continue restoring balance to the Federal courts by considering more of President Biden's judicial appointments.

Over the next 2 days, we will consider Deborah Boardman to serve as district judge in Maryland and Candace Jackson-Akiwumi to serve as judge on the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals. Together, Ms. Boardman and Ms. Jackson-Akiwumi have had over 20 years of experience as Federal defenders.

I believe that bringing professional diversity as well as personal diversity to the bench should be and is now a top priority. There are plenty of former prosecutors and corporate lawyers wearing black robes. It is time that some voting rights attorneys, civil rights attorneys, and former Federal defenders, like these two nominees, bring their perspectives to the bench.

A final vote on Ms. Boardman's nomination will come this afternoon, and then we will proceed to the nomination of Ms. Jackson-Akiwumi, which we will finish before the end of the week. Again, the Senate will not leave for the week until we finish considering these judges. The Democratic majority in the Senate will continue to swiftly fill judicial vacancies.

On a related note, today, Chairman PETERS will ask the Senate to approve two critical cyber security nominees: Jen Easterly to be the Director of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency and Robin Carnahan to be the Administrator of the GSA. Both of these Agencies play a critical role in our Nation's cyber security.

The threat of ransomware attacks and other cyber crimes is on the rise from State actors as well as cyber bandits who were given sanctuary by our adversaries. We need people at the helm on these important Agencies to focus on hardening our Nation's cyber security. This should be a completely nonpartisan issue, and my Republican friends should not object.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, in addition to our important work on judicial appointments, the Senate is moving forward on multiple legislative proposals to make historic investments in our Nation's infrastructure.

We have a chance in this Congress to get something big and bold done on infrastructure—something we haven't managed in a very long time. If we want America to prosper in the 21st century, we can't do it with infrastructure that is stuck in the last century. This is our chance to update, modernize, repair, and rebuild for another century of American economic growth, creating thousands upon thousands of good-paying jobs in the process.

Later today, Speaker PELOSI and I will meet with representatives from

the White House to discuss the next steps on this very topic. Here in the Senate, Democratic members of the Budget Committee continue to build on the fruitful conversations we had last week. In fact, earlier today, I spoke with all of our committee chairs about a forthcoming budget resolution.

As I have said, discussions about infrastructure are progressing along two tracks. The first is bipartisan, and the second incorporates elements of the President's American jobs and families plan. The second track is something we must support even if it doesn't get any Republican support. For several weeks, the trains have been chugging down both tracks quite well. When the Senate returns after the July 4 work period, it will be time to take the next step forward.

This summer, the Senate will begin considering the fiscal 2022 budget resolution and a bipartisan infrastructure bill on the floor. It is my hope to have both a bipartisan infrastructure bill and a budget resolution for the Senate to consider this summer. I believe the progress we have made in recent weeks will ultimately produce the result that will set our economy on a path to prosperity for generations to come.

STUDENT LOANS

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, one final matter: student loans. Today, I have joined Senator WARREN and a number of my House and Senate colleagues to urge the Biden administration to extend the pause on payments and interest for the vast majority of Federal student loans.

For millions of student borrowers, one of the most difficult challenges is balancing their debt with their dreams of starting a career, starting a family, and buying a home. When the pandemic hit, these challenges were magnified a hundredfold. Job opportunities disappeared, and our economy came to a halt. The pause on student loan repayment during the pandemic was a life-altering policy that allowed tens of millions of young people to escape financial ruin.

Right now, the current pause on repayment of student debt is set to expire on September 30. I believe that is too soon. Our economy is still recovering. Americans are still pulling themselves up and dusting themselves off after one of the greatest economic crises in our history. The October 1 expiration date could risk putting millions of student loan borrowers back into financial hardship.

Very simply, I am urging the Biden administration to extend the pause on student loan repayment by another 6 months, until March 2022. Even as the economy recovers, young people, borrowers with a load of debt, will struggle more than most to get back on their feet. Why not give them a little more breathing room?

I urge the Biden administration to extend the pause, and I will continue

working with Senator WARREN on ways to provide even more comprehensive, life-changing student loan forgiveness—a policy, I believe, that will expand opportunity for millions, millions of young Americans.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

RUSSIA

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, for the first time earlier this month, President Biden traveled to Europe. The primary purpose for this trip was to engage with some of America's closest friends and allies, but the agenda also included a one-on-one meeting with a staunch adversary, Vladimir Putin.

The President took office armed with a great deal of tough talk on Russia. He called his counterpart a "killer" and a "KGB thug" and warned he would "pay [the] price" for interference in U.S. elections. The world wondered whether this rhetoric would be underpinned by tough action. I certainly hoped it would.

Back in January, I made it clear that if the Biden administration was serious about "imposing real costs on Moscow," it would "find willing partners on Capitol Hill." But so far, there have been few encouraging signs for those of us who take Russia's threats very seriously.

Remember, after less than a week in office, President Biden agreed to Russian requests for a full 5-year extension of the New START Treaty, no strings attached. He gave it up for free, undermining our leverage to extract concessions in future negotiations.

Then, his administration rolled out a budget proposal that would cut investment in defense, in real terms—short-changing the modernization we need to keep pace with both Russia and China.

And 2 weeks ago, the President left for Europe, having already given the Kremlin two other gifts: a high-profile summit that experts predicted Putin would use to help legitimize his regime at home and abroad and a waiver of sanctions on the Russian-owned company behind a lucrative gas pipeline project.

So I will repeat for President Biden the same warning I offered to the previous administration: The Kremlin is

not our friend, and it is high time our actions started reflecting that.

Back home, of course, the Biden administration has proven it knows perfectly well how to crack down on energy pipeline projects when it wants to. In fact, on the day he left for Europe, the firm behind the Keystone XL Pipeline project announced that the President's revocation of its construction permit would be fatal. That is the end of it. What a striking image. The President of the United States heads overseas and meets with a major adversary whom he has handed a major geopolitical win, and here at home, the last nail goes in the coffin of the job-killing crusade against reliable North American energy that he said on day one was a priority.

It is a tale of two pipelines: the decisive rejection of thousands of American jobs here at home and the empowerment of America's adversaries abroad. And it is only the latest sign that the Biden administration's strategic priorities are simply out of order.

Recall, this administration rushed to rejoin a climate agreement that has failed to hold major signatories to their commitments on reducing emissions, even as the United States recorded multiple years of reductions on our own.

This administration made it harder to cap our abundant and domestic energy, even at the risk of greater reliance on imports from countries with lower environmental standards. And, of course, they proposed to squander years of accumulating economic pressure on Iran in exchange for no meaningful concessions on its nuclear ambitions or regional aggression.

So when President Biden elected to pass on another opportunity to check the influence of a major adversary, we had heard this story before.

Here in Congress, opposition to the completion of the Nord Stream 2 Pipeline has been vigorous and bipartisan. Last year's Defense authorization, which earned 84 votes here in the Senate, expanded the scope of sanctions against critical entities involved in its construction. We are talking about a project that would give Putin a new artery of influence in Western Europe and rob Ukraine of critical leverage over the way Russian energy currently flows throughout the region.

But, apparently, the Biden administration's own opposition to the project was just rhetorical. When the chips were down, the President used a waiver to avoid having to place sanctions on the biggest company behind the project and its CEO—a Putin crony. According to reports, his decision even overruled the objections of senior diplomats and the concerns of his very own Secretary of State.

Oddly enough, the administration's decision to snuff out union jobs in the energy sector here at home didn't seem to prompt as vigorous an internal debate. In fact, President Biden's Executive action to kill the Keystone XL has

been followed by a steady stream of radical proposals that illustrate just how deep his administration is in thrall to the environmental fringe.

Under the guise of infrastructure, they pitched trillions of dollars in Federal spending, aligned so closely with most liberal interests in Congress that the authors—the authors—of the Green New Deal boasted President Biden's agenda had their manifesto's DNA all over it: unprecedented spending on electric vehicles, huge increases in funds for transit projects that disproportionately benefit blue States on the coast, and plans to pick winners and losers in the market for affordable, reliable American energy.

So American workers know what a thriving energy sector looks like. It is exactly what Republicans spent 4 years working to encourage here at home.

As a matter of fact, if you hit pause on Washington Democrats' radical climate rhetoric, you will notice that smart energy policy isn't limited by political stripe. For years, the liberal government up in Canada has recognized pipelines as a safe and efficient way to connect people with affordable, reliable energy and grow what is already the largest sector of United States-Canada trade. So it was hardly surprising to hear one Canadian official greet President Biden's decision to sink the Keystone XL Pipeline as "an insult"—an insult—or to read that the Canadian firm behind the project is now pursuing legal action to recoup its investment.

So capitulation to our rivals, painful blows to our neighbors, legitimizing corrupt foreign leaders, and jamming hard-working Americans—whatever his motives, and despite his own rhetoric, the consequences of President Biden's actions are already clear.

It is not too late to impose real costs on Russia's pipeline windfall and provide serious, lethal support to Ukraine and other vulnerable States on the frontlines of Putin's aggression. It is not too late to get serious about the defense investment that bipartisan assessments say that we need—that we need—in order to compete with China and Russia. It is not too late to recommit to bipartisanship on infrastructure and on energy and show radical climate activists the door.

I hope the Biden administration changes courses sometime soon.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority whip.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, what is the weather like in Las Vegas? What is it like in Reno? I am not sure, but I will bet it is hot. And the reason I am sure that it is likely to be hot is the weather forecast.

I looked at that map, and it was solid red in the western half of the United States, with extreme high temperatures at a level never recorded. They said in the city of Seattle, there have

only been a handful of times that they have had temperatures over 100 degrees in that city. It is going to happen again this weekend, at least that is the prediction. That is the weather forecast.

It is not just confined to the blue coastal States, as some call them. We have a drought in the Midwest. I hope it ends soon, but when it comes to corn country—Iowa, Illinois, Indiana—we are worried. I hope it doesn't happen, but it could, and we know it can happen soon. And then in the southeastern part of the United States, there are extreme storms—rains they haven't seen before.

I just say that after listening to the Republican leader describe the situation with the environment, wondering if he reads the papers or talks to people back home because extreme weather is happening all over the United States, and it isn't just in Republican areas or Democratic areas; it is virtually everywhere.

So when President Biden comes in and says: Shouldn't we do something about this for the good of our children and our grandchildren? Shouldn't we be willing to sacrifice a little bit? Shouldn't we be willing to change some if it means that they are going to have a planet that is worth living on—about 10 years ago, I started asking my farmers who come and visit me from Illinois a couple of questions. These are good people. They never vote for me, I know that, but I still like meeting with them. They are good people. They bring their wives. They dress up in their suits. They take it seriously. They are coming to Washington. This is before COVID-19, of course. And they would sit upstairs in my conference room. There would be about 20 or 30 of them from organizations like the Farm Bureau or the corn growers or the soybean growers. And I would say to them—this is 10 years ago—how many of you believe that what we are doing on Earth is changing the environment of the Earth we live on? I mean that our human activity is having something to do with it. And I would ask for a show of hands. And the response was, not one hand would go up.

And I finally said to them: Well, things are changing. What do you think is behind all of it? And one fellow said—and he did this seriously, and I believe he was speaking from the heart—he said: "Senator, some years God sends me a drought; some years God sends me a flood; I got to deal with whatever God sends me."

I respect him for that. That is his deep-hearted belief, and it is sincere.

But I think there is more to the story. And now when I ask these same farmers the same question, I get a different response. The Illinois corn growers, looking around, thinking something is happening here in this wonderful, bountiful State that I live in. The crops that are grown traditionally are not producing what they did traditionally, unless some hybrid seeds and other fertilizers are being used. There

are new weather conditions and it is changing every year and it is not getting better. It is getting dryer and hotter.

So when Joe Biden starts talking about the next generation of energy in America, I think about my granddaughter, "Little Jo." I think about Jo, and I am wondering what kind of world she is going to live in and what I am going to do about it.

One thing that President Biden said was, we are moving toward electric vehicles. You would think that it was some Federal mandate that is bringing this on. But if you read the newspapers, you know it isn't. General Motors has accelerated the timetable to go to electric vehicles, Ford as well. They see the writing on the wall.

What we currently use for transportation will not be what we use in 10 or 15 years. It is going to change. We are going to move to electric vehicles for a variety of reasons, not the least of which is there are fewer emissions, greenhouse gas emissions.

The country of Norway just announced last week that over 50 percent of their vehicles are electric vehicles. If you had been there in the recent past, you see Teslas in every direction, electric vehicles in every direction.

I spoke to the Ambassador from Norway, and I said: How did that happen? How did you move to a point where more than half the vehicles in Norway are electric vehicles?

She said: Tax breaks. We gave them tax breaks. And all of a sudden, everyone had a new lifestyle with electric vehicles. And they think that protects them in the future or at least holds the possibility of reducing the pollution that they are dealing with, and I think they are right. So does Joe Biden. But when we get into an infrastructure debate with Republicans, the first thing they say is: Take electric vehicles off the table. We don't want to even talk about it. No subsidies, no encouragement for those.

Traditionally, we have been encouraging oil companies, with all sorts of tax breaks throughout their history, to continue to explore and grow in size and make a lot of money. But the notion of encouraging electric vehicles is somehow heretical to our friends on the Republican side. I think it is very shortsighted.

I think we should look at the obvious. I tell this story, and it is worth repeating. Six years ago, we had an auto plant in Normal, IL—yes, that is the name of it: Normal, IL. Six years ago, Mitsubishi closed their auto plant. There were more than 1,000 people working there, and there was that big sprawling complex just off of Interstate 55. Every time you took that interstate and looked out there, you thought: That is going to be there forever. That building is just going to deteriorate and be there forever.

Well, guess what. A year after they closed, the mayor of Normal, IL, whose name is Chris Koos—a wonderful

mayor—called me and said: Senator, I think I have a buyer for the Mitsubishi plant.

I said: What kind of buyer?

He said: There is a man who wants to build electric vehicles. He came down and took a look, and he liked that plant. He said it was way too big for his purposes, but he is actually thinking of building electric vehicles in the old Mitsubishi plant.

Darned if it didn't happen. The company is called Rivian. They bought that plant, and they started building electric vehicles—just this month, officially, in production.

How many workers will they have? Up to 4,000, maybe even 5,000. Will they be able to use the whole plant? They are now building an addition to the plant. Is it a viable company? Is it going to last? Well, obviously Amazon thinks so because they have invested a billion dollars in Rivian. And the companies are coming from all around thinking this is the future.

So I say to the Senator from Kentucky, yes, there will be transitions in jobs, but there are job opportunities at Rivian and places just like that. Lion Electric is another company. It came in from Canada. They build electric buses. One of the things we are envisioning is moving toward electric schoolbuses across America. That is a big move. This is a company that builds them.

We need more just like it, and there are going to be good-paying jobs associated with it.

EVBox is a company out of the Netherlands, located in my State again. They build the charging stations.

Closing your eyes to the opportunities here is very shortsighted. Things are changing, and changing for the better. And because there is change, it doesn't mean it is bad for everybody. There are transitions, and we ought to help with educating people, preparing them for the new jobs.

But if you look around at this world and what is happening with the weather patterns and the environment, how shortsighted it would be for us to say to our kids and grandkids: Well, we had a chance back in 2021 to do something about it, but we decided it just might make people uneasy to think about that much change.

Well, I feel uneasy about the change that is coming if we do nothing. It is going to be a dramatic change for the worse for our kids.

VLADIMIR PUTIN

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, on another topic, this notion that Joe Biden is being pushed around by Vladimir Putin—the Senator who made that statement on the floor, or one just like it, has he ignored what happened over the last 4 years?

Every time the President of the United States, Donald Trump, would meet with Vladimir Putin, they would ask the translators to leave the room,

the people from the intelligence agencies to leave the room, and they would just play pat-a-cake. I mean, we know what was going on there. There was some sort of political bromance between the President and Vladimir Putin.

I don't believe that is ever going to happen with Joe Biden. He is a realist. He made it clear that he went in that meeting with Putin to lay down the law in terms of infiltrating our elections in the future and the activities that we have seen in hacking and cyber crimes.

That is the kind of leadership we need in dealing with Vladimir Putin.

JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, today I want to speak about two really highly qualified judicial nominees the Senate Judiciary Committee came up with through the White House.

The first is Candace Jackson-Akiwumi, who has been nominated to an Illinois seat on the Seventh Circuit. With her qualifications, temperament, and range of experience, she is outstanding.

She is the daughter of two judges. Her father, Raymond Jackson, is a Federal district court judge, and her mother, Gwendolyn Jones Jackson, is a retired State court judge.

She went to Princeton and then Yale Law School—not bad. She clerked for Judge David Coar on the U.S. District Court for the Northern District and for Roger Gregory on the Fourth Circuit.

After her clerkships, she worked in private practice, and then she made an interesting career decision, and not many people make it. She decided to stop practicing in the private practice of law and become a staff attorney at the Federal Defender Program for the Northern District of Illinois, representing people who couldn't afford counsel.

Ms. Jackson-Akiwumi spent 10 years as a Federal public defender. She defended hundreds of indigent clients at every stage of the legal process. She is a real lawyer. She knows that courtroom inside and out, and she knows the legal process as well.

Ms. Jackson-Akiwumi's experience and perspective on the criminal justice system will be an asset in the Seventh Circuit. If she is approved, she will be the second woman of color to be in that circuit. It is about time.

Her skills and legal expertise will be invaluable. She received a "well qualified" rating by the ABA.

She has a great temperament. One of our Senators on the Judiciary Committee tried to trap her with a question, seeing just whether she knew enough about the law. When it was all over, I think he was satisfied that she did.

She spoke to the fact that her mother taught her how important it is for judges to listen and for litigants to be heard. This is a fundamental principle

in our system of justice. She is going to devote her life to defending the rule of law in the future, as she has in the past. I really think she is going to be extraordinary.

The second nominee the Senate will vote on this week has my strong support as well, Judge Deborah Boardman, nominated to the U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland.

She serves as a U.S. magistrate judge in the Maryland District Court. Like Jackson-Akiwumi, she has received a "well qualified" rating from the ABA. She, too, will bring diversity to the courts.

She spent 11 years as a Federal public defender herself. She is bringing a perspective which is often not found in these court cases with sitting judges. I have nothing against former prosecutors. I have named a lot of them to the bench. But we ought to have diversity in background, experience, and the like.

She has experience in private practice. She is a dedicated public servant, and I hope my colleagues will support her.

FOR THE PEOPLE ACT OF 2021

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I watched television Sunday night with my wife. There was a movie called "Selma." Oprah Winfrey had something to do with it because she was in it, and it was, as you might expect, a quality production.

It told the story of what happened in 1965 in Selma, AL. It showed the horrific images of Americans being beaten and brutalized in Selma for daring to protest peacefully. For what? For the right to vote.

Fewer people know about Turnaround Tuesday. That was the day, 2 days after Bloody Sunday, when many of the same people who had been beaten on the Edmund Pettus Bridge on Bloody Sunday went back to that bridge to make it plain that they were going to come back again and again until every right of every citizen to vote was secured. That was Turnaround Tuesday.

I had a lucky experience. The late John Lewis, who marched across that Edmund Pettus Bridge and almost gave his life in the process, took me, one foggy Sunday morning, for a walk across the Edmund Pettus Bridge, and he told me what he remembered from that day.

I have seen pictures over and over again. There he is in his white raincoat, with a backpack, marching in the front of the line, and how he was bashed in the head by either a trooper or someone who came along trying to stop them from marching. He almost died as a result of it. It was something I will never forget. I feel blessed that I had that experience.

And then there was the vote on the floor yesterday. What a disappointment. Today, I want to say it is "welcome back" Wednesday. Welcome back

to the fight to preserve voting rights that has never ended.

It didn't start on that bridge in Selma, and it won't end in this Chamber in Washington. This battle is going to continue because there are those people who know that if you want to control America politically, you have got to control those who vote.

We saw it after the Civil War, when we ended slavery and African Americans initially had an opportunity to vote and lead in Southern States. And then, sad to report, my political party, the Democratic Party at that time, was part of initiating the Jim Crow laws, which made it difficult, if not impossible, to vote.

And the battle was on, and it is being waged to this day, about whether or not African Americans have a right to vote. Make no mistake. When Republicans come to the floor and go through these long, elaborate explanations of why a coordinated effort by Republican legislatures in 20 different States is just good government, I think they know better. It is not good government, and it is not good for the people of those States, particularly if you are a minority.

Well, this fight to prevent billions from buying elections and root out corruption in government didn't end with that filibuster yesterday. Republicans succeeded in delaying this debate for a time, but they are not going to derail it. This is too important. Our democracy is on the line.

Five months ago—I am sure Madam President will never forget it, as I won't—a murderous mob—five people died—a murderous mob attacked this Capitol and tried to overturn the Presidential election.

Who sent them? Well, it is clear to me who sent them: a vain, self-pitying former President who couldn't accept defeat or the will of the American people. So Donald Trump created a Big Lie that the election was stolen. He used that lie to incite that mob to attack this Capitol. He continues to peddle the Big Lie from his exile at some country club.

Now the party that coddled that failed President when he was in power is weaponizing the Big Lie and using it to justify a relentless attack on voting rights across America.

Three weeks ago, Senate Republicans used the filibuster to kill a bill creating an independent, bipartisan commission to investigate who was behind this January 6 insurrection. They killed it with the filibuster, just as they tried to kill the voting rights bill yesterday. That filibuster is an echo, sadly, of how it has been used in the area of civil rights for as long as it has been in the Senate.

This Big Lie is metastasizing; it is growing. Instead of stopping it, Republicans are using all their leverage to prevent us from confronting it. The filibuster yesterday was day one of this fight. It wasn't the end of the story.

Welcome to day two. We mean to keep marching until we cross that

bridge and stop this assault on our democracy and put an end to the Big Lie once and for all.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Deborah L. Boardman, of Maryland, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has been recognized.

DEMOCRATIC AGENDA

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam President, it seems that for the past month Senate Republicans have watched as our Democratic colleagues send up one partisan test balloon after another.

They threatened a battle over a so-called equal pay bill, which turned out to be chum in the water for the trial lawyers but really not much else. Then they, once again, threatened the Second Amendment, but they couldn't find a friend across party lines to join them in that fight. So that trial balloon was popped.

And who could forget their promise to bring the improperly named Equality Act to the floor for a vote? Well, that balloon didn't take flight either. And, yesterday, the Democrats' democracy-destroying election takeover bill almost survived, but it too came crashing back to Earth after failing to clear a procedural hurdle.

Still, they have made the most of their time over the past month, holding up their string of failures as evidence that it is the filibuster and not the radically partisan nature of their agenda that is thwarting their progress.

As the Republican leader said at the beginning of this month, it was an agenda that was designed to fail. It failed to bring them the power that they are craving to have over the lives of millions of Americans. It failed to kill the filibuster, and it certainly failed the millions of Americans who have been forced to watch, dumbfounded, as this circus played out in realtime on their television screens.

It was a complete waste of our time. It is what one of my Tennesseans said this weekend, talking about these trial balloons, talking about this lurch to the left—and Madam President, this was a friend of mine who is a Democrat—as he said, it was a complete waste of our time, the American people's time. He added: It was a complete waste of my dime—for the tax dollars that he sends to Washington, DC. He went on to say: Think about the problems you could have solved if you had been focused on making some progress instead of creating chaos.

Yesterday, the Commerce Committee held a hearing on achieving broadband resiliency. As you well know, this is one of the most important infrastructure problems that not only faces our committee but also faces this body. We had a great discussion, and I thanked Chairman LUJÁN for that hearing. But I can't help but wonder how much more progress we would have been able to make on this issue if the 14 million unserved rural Americans—yes, unserved; they have nothing—think about the progress we could have made if those 14 million unserved Americans had taken precedence in the minds and in the agenda of our friends across the aisle. It would have been great to focus on that.

Speaking of infrastructure, perhaps we could have focused more energy on giving the needed authority to our local officials so they can fix crumbling roads and bridges and getting regulations out of their way so they can go to work helping people get to work and helping children get back to school. Certainly, I know a few officials in Memphis who would love to see us start thinking long term about practical infrastructure support that doesn't include the Green New Deal fantasies that are favored by this White House.

The American people have noticed this lack of focus and this freewheeling attitude when it comes to spending taxpayers' money. When they look around, they see real need. There are businesses and families who are still struggling to pull themselves out of the ashes of the pandemic. Policies that are favored by the Democrats would be policies that would bankrupt their businesses, that would drive up the debt, and that would cause massive inflation. Tennesseans know these policies are not going to help them. What it does do is to frustrate them. Neither will the Democrats' continued failure to manage President Biden's border crisis.

In April, Customs and Border Protection apprehended 178,000 people attempting to illegally cross our border. Fourteen thousand of these were unaccompanied alien children. It is a record year for drug runners, for the cartels, for bootleggers, for human traffickers, and for sex traffickers. We caught the Department of Health and Human Services actually finishing the work of the cartels, trafficking many of those

unaccompanied minors through the Chattanooga Airport without the knowledge or the involvement of local officials.

Meanwhile, my Democratic colleagues are treating this humanitarian crisis as if it is nothing more than a logistics challenge. But perhaps if we had spent more time on this in the past month, we could have convinced them that until they get this crisis under control, they would have to admit, in this country right now, every town is a border town; every State, a border State. Just ask your local law enforcement. They will tell you. Perhaps they didn't want to put the time there because they had been busy putting a show on for the cameras and their friends on the left.

Tennesseans noticed what went on here this month. They are not happy about it. They have been reaching out. They don't have the luxury of playing political games. They don't have the spare resources to gamble on woke politics. They are trying to keep the doors of their businesses and their churches and their schools and their factories open.

We did a lot of talking this month, but the friends on the left chose not to take action to solve problems. I would encourage them to do a little soul-searching over the next couple of weeks and address the agenda that the American people would seek to have addressed.

I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BALDWIN). Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 172, Deborah L. Boardman, of Maryland, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Benjamin L. Cardin, Chris Van Hollen, Jacky Rosen, John Hickenlooper, Tammy Baldwin, Richard Blumenthal, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Raphael Warnock, Martin Heinrich, Christopher Murphy, Sheldon Whitehouse, Bernard Sanders, Jeff Merkley, Patty Murray, Margaret Wood Hassan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Deborah L. Boardman, of Maryland, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 247 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Baldwin	Heinrich	Reed
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Blumenthal	Hirono	Sanders
Booker	Kaine	Schatz
Brown	Kelly	Schumer
Cantwell	King	Shaheen
Cardin	Klobuchar	Sinema
Carper	Leahy	Smith
Casey	Lujan	Stabenow
Collins	Manchin	Tester
Coons	Markey	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Warner
Duckworth	Merkley	Warnock
Durbin	Murphy	Warren
Feinstein	Murray	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Wyden
Graham	Padilla	
Hassan	Peters	

NAYS—48

Barrasso	Grassley	Portman
Blackburn	Hagerty	Risch
Blunt	Hawley	Romney
Boozman	Hoeven	Rounds
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Burr	Inhofe	Sasse
Capito	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Lankford	Shelby
Cotton	Lee	Sullivan
Cramer	Lummis	Thune
Crapo	Marshall	Tillis
Cruz	McConnell	Toomey
Daines	Moran	Tuberville
Ernst	Murkowski	Wicker
Fischer	Paul	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 52, the nays are 48.

The motion is agreed to.

The Democratic whip.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 1652

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, last week, I told the story of a mother who received critical support from an organization called Life Span in Chicago after her daughter was sexually assaulted by the mother's husband. The services provided by Life Span were paid for by the Victims of Crime Act, VOCA.

This week, I want to tell you another story that is even more troubling, but it dramatizes the need for us to act today, this afternoon. I am going to use the name "Sasha," not the real name of the woman involved. She is a mother of three kids, and she was living with a man who was unpredictable and dangerous.

He tried to kill her—not once but three times. He tried strangling her, and the third time, she passed out. When she woke up with the kids nearby, she knew that was it. She couldn't take it anymore. So she went to a hospital. She was scared to death. She heard about a group called Harbor House. Harbor House is basically a domestic violence survivors center.

I would tell my colleagues in the Senate, if you have ever visited a domestic violence survivors center and met with any of the victims, you will never forget it. I swear, you will never forget it. I can remember the first time I met with one of the victims in one of the shelters. She was crying. Her eyes were red, one eye was blackened, and she choked back the tears and told me the story of what she lived through. For some reason—and I am not a psychologist; I can't explain it—she blamed herself. And it happens so often.

What happens to these women who are the victims of domestic violence abuse? Where do they go? Some of them can't find anywhere to go and end up dying as a result of it. What happens to their kids who witness these acts of violence in the home when mom is getting strangled by this man? What happens to them? Well, luckily, we care enough in America to do something about it. Through VOCA and the Crime Victims Fund, we send money to Harbor House and Life Span and other agencies and say: Do your best. Help them put their lives back together again. Protect them.

Well, I want to fast-forward and tell you that 6 months after Sasha's experience, things are much better. She lives safely in an apartment. She still works with adult counselors and youth counselors to get herself and her kids through this, and she knows that she is not alone. These VOCA-funded advocates stepped into her life at just the right moment and saved her life. They may have saved the lives of her children too.

So when we cut back on funding for whatever reason, we are jeopardizing the services that I just described that are so critical.

With decreased VOCA funding—if we do nothing today, with decreased VOCA funding, Harbor House will have to cut its staffers, exactly the types of professionals who helped Sasha and her family.

The executive director said:

If VOCA is cut, imagine being Sasha and having to go through all of that alone.

That is why we have to pass this bill. That is why it is so critical.

As I noted last week, VOCA passed in 1984 to establish the Crime Victims Fund. We can't even count the number of people who have been helped over the years. Three thousand applicants come through my State Attorney General's Office in Illinois, and every State has a similar story to tell of thousands of victims helped by service providers, victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, child abuse, trafficking, and drunk drivers.

And the Crime Victims Fund doesn't receive a dime of taxpayers' dollars. How about that? What I just described for you doesn't come out of the Treasury. It is funded through criminal fines, penalties, forfeited bail bonds, and special assessments collected by the Federal Government.

Historically, most of the money comes from criminal fines, but in recent years, deposits have dropped off significantly. That is why we are here at this moment. They need help, and they need it now.

Monetary penalties from deferred prosecutions and nonprosecution agreements are currently deposited in the Treasury instead of the fund. As a result, the shift has had a devastating impact on the fund. That is why a bipartisan, bicameral group of Members of Congress, working with advocacy organizations, have come up with this

VOCA fix. Our bill would stabilize the depleted fund by redirecting monetary penalties from deferred prosecutions and nonprosecution agreements to the victims and service providers who need the help.

The reduced deposits into the fund have already had a devastating impact. Victim assistance grants have been reduced by more than \$600 million in this year. And more cuts are coming if we don't do something today.

Like Harbor House, advocates across the State and across the country are begging for help. We don't have any time to waste. Every day that goes by, we miss an opportunity to help replenish the fund and to put these services on the street.

So far this year, the fund has already missed out on a total of nearly \$550 million in deposits that could be helping these agencies, and we are not even halfway through the year. That is why it is imperative that we pass this bill. The House already did it in March, 3 months ago—broad bipartisan support. Here in the Senate, we have a broad bipartisan coalition of Senators—36 Democrats and 21 Republicans. We all get it. We are all for crime victims. But we have been stopped because of an objection on the floor.

Let's end this today. Whatever the merits of any budgetary argument, for goodness' sake, lives are at stake here. Unfortunately, this objection about moving forward was made last week, and it probably will be made again today. It involves Senator TOOMEY's concern about a budgetary issue. It is a complicated issue about something called CHIMPs, for goodness' sake, which he can explain, and I am sure he will.

But after last week's argument on this, I went to the advocates who are telling us that we should send this money as quickly as we can and said: Is he right? Is this designed, without his amendment, so that this money will not go to the people who need it?

They said he is wrong. This is not going to happen.

Here is their statement: "During floor remarks for the unanimous consent [last week], it was represented the VOCA Fix Act fails to correct certain structural issues that prevent the funds from reaching victims and their advocates. The premise of this statement—that these structural issues impact the distribution of VOCA funds to survivors and advocates—is not accurate."

This is from the actual agencies themselves.

"While the use of CHIMPS (Changes in Mandatory Programs) as budget offsets continues to be a contentious issue, the claim that Appropriators hoard money rather than releasing it to victim service providers is false."

Inaccurate and false.

"In reality, Appropriators have substantially decreased the size of the budget offset by releasing far more than the amount required by the pro-

posed substitute, and the proposed substitute intended to restructure the entire appropriations process is incredibly controversial."

In other words, we are going to dive into the deep end of the pool on budget process, budget rules, and budget regulation while people are literally drowning in violence—victims of domestic abuse.

For goodness' sake, isn't there a better time and place and a better group to hold hostage? It shouldn't be these domestic violence cases.

I yield at this point to the Senator from Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I won't speak long, but I wanted to echo the comments of our distinguished Judiciary chairman, because I have had a similar experience.

As we were going through COVID, I was hearing from our domestic violence groups in Rhode Island that two things were happening at once. Instances were going up. People were trapped together. It was very difficult to find sanctuary houses to go to, and the experience of domestic violence was soaring. And while that was going on, the funding coming into these agencies through VOCA was declining.

Now there is a pretty simple—well, first let me thank the Rhode Island Coalition Against Domestic Violence and Sojourner House, which provides sanctuary services, and Progreso Latino, which works in this space in our Latino community, for their great work. There are a lot of organizations in this space, and I want to start by appreciating them.

The problem has nothing to do with domestic violence or domestic violence victims as to the money. The problem is that more and more of these cases are resolved by deferred prosecution and nonprosecution agreements, but the funding for VOCA comes out of criminal sentences, criminal prosecutions. So because of that change in the way these cases are treated—which is actually a good thing, generally—the money is diverted, and, as a result, the Crime Victims Fund has reached its lowest level in 10 years.

The victim assistance grants in Rhode Island fell 50 percent—5-0 percent—cut in half from fiscal year 2016 to fiscal year 2021, from \$7.6 million to \$3.8 million, which means that many of these local organizations that put their heart and soul into protecting these victims at the worst time in their lives have to deal with 50-percent cuts.

This is simple. It will allow monetary penalties in those deferred prosecutions and nonprosecution agreements to flow the same way they flow when traditional prosecutions take place.

This is endorsed across the board. This is as noncontroversial as you get—56 State and Territorial attorneys general, more than 1,700 local, Tribal, State, regional, and national advocacy, government, and law enforcement organizations.

Just this year, \$545 million has been lost to the VOCA fund because we haven't corrected this. So I would echo my chairman's remarks and urge my friend, the Senator from Pennsylvania, to find another point of leverage, another fulcrum, for his efforts to solve unrelated problems, but let this problem be solved and let these victims be served.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island.

As if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 1652, which was received from the House and is at the desk; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I have good news for my colleagues from Illinois and Rhode Island, and that is that the modification that I am suggesting to the unanimous consent request proffered by the Senator from Illinois is not complicated. It has nothing to do with budget rules, and, in fact, it is the simplest thing in the world.

Now, the Senator from Illinois wants to put more money and money from a new source into the Crime Victims Fund. I completely agree. I fully support it. I have liked this idea from the first time I heard of it, and I supported it.

But there is something that is important to note here. The Crime Victims Fund is a Federal Government account, and the Senator is very determined that more money go into that account.

So what do we disagree on? Well, it is very simple. The Senator from Illinois seems to be equally determined that there can be no requirement that the money actually come out of that account and go to crime victims and their advocates. That is the only thing that I want to do differently. It is to insist that money going into that account actually comes out and goes to the victims of crime and their advocates.

Now, if my concern that this money is not going to end up going where it is advertised to go is not valid, then, I don't know why my colleagues wouldn't agree to my very narrow amendment which, by the way, doesn't have a thing to do with budget rules. I don't attempt to change budget rules in this effort. We should change them, but this isn't where I am trying to do it. What I am simply trying to do is to make sure that the money that goes into the account—the increase, too—actually goes to where it is supposed to go, which is to the victims of crimes and their advocates.

So you have to ask yourself: Why would somebody oppose the proposal that this money actually be required to go to victims and their advocates? Why would somebody oppose that?

Maybe it is because there is some other place that some of this money is meant to go, and that is at the heart of this. See, under the ridiculous rules we operate under, if the money doesn't end up going to crime victims and their advocates, then, it frees up additional money to be spent on whatever anybody else wants to spend it on. The money that is withheld from the people who are supposed to get it, crime victims and their advocates, creates the opportunity to spend more on who knows what.

Now, would anyone actually do this or is this just a theoretical construct that I have made up? Well, let's take a look at the recent history. The fact is, since 2000, in the year 2000, over \$80 billion that could have and should have gone to crime victims and their advocates was intentionally withheld so that more money could be spent in other categories.

What this chart shows is the amount of money year in and year out. It starts in 2000. You see these low bars. Well under a billion dollars was actually allocated to crime victims.

There was much more money going into those accounts—much more money—because, you see, how much going into the account isn't the only thing that matters. What is actually, ultimately, much more important is how much comes out of the account and goes to the crime victims. And only when I and some of my colleagues started raising hell about this—the dishonesty, the deception, the fact that the crime victims and their advocates weren't getting nearly what they were supposed to be getting—only then—this is the red line that represents when we started doing this—that is when the allocations started to change.

This graph represents the huge surge in funds that we have been sending to crime victims and their advocates in recent years because some of us were no longer willing to tolerate this and we were raising Cain about what had been going on.

Now, what I am simply trying to do is to prevent us from going back to what was routine around here, what was standard operating procedure, which was to deceive people, pretend that money was going to end up going to the Crime Victims Fund when everybody knew it wasn't.

Now, why would I be concerned that we might be going back in that direction? Well, I will tell you why. President Biden has been very instructive about this. In his budget that he released just months ago, he actually specifies that in his budget he wants money to be diverted from the crime victims fund, which is mentioned by name, and one other fund, so that more money can be spent on other purposes.

This is my concern. This isn't something that has been made up. This is

President Biden in his budget asking us to go right back to what we used to do.

So, then, when I come down here and I suggest one modification to the very constructive idea that we add this settlement money to the fund, and the modification is that the money actually has to go to crime victims and their advocates, that is objected to. People are insistent that we not have a requirement that this money actually be allocated.

So someone might think that that is a pretty strong body of evidence that suggests that maybe all of this money isn't going to end up where it is supposed to go.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator modify his request to include my amendment, which is at the desk; that it be considered and agreed to; and that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed, and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, if you listen to this explanation, there is one thing missing and it is critical. There is a suggestion that this money for the Crime Victims Fund is being spent for another purpose. You never heard that, did you? It said it could be, maybe it will be, it might be—but it hasn't been.

Listen to what they say, these people in the advocacy groups are jealously watching every penny. They want every dollar, just as you do and I do. And what do they say about your argument?

The premise of your statement that these structural issues impact the distribution of the victims funds to survivors and advocates is not accurate. It goes on to say that the claim that appropriators hoard the money rather than releasing it to victims services is false. This is from the very agencies receiving the money.

Are they in on the deal, Senator?

I don't think so. They are desperate for these funds, and without them, they are going to have a serious cutback in services.

The proposed substitute intended to restructure the entire appropriations process is incredibly controversial, and you know it and I know it as a member of the Appropriations Committee. Yet you are tangling up this relief for the victims of crime, victims of domestic abuse, women who are seeking shelter and hospital care and trying to care for their children and what they are going through. You want to hold back on the possibility—the possibility—that somebody is going to spend this on something else, even though you have no proof that it has been done—none.

And the people who are the advocates for these groups are saying to you: What you are saying is inaccurate and false.

And you won't give it up.

I would suggest: Pick another target. Find some other group to make your budget point of order. Please don't take this out on these people who are in the most desperate situations in their life. This is not the time and place to raise this budget debate. I seriously hope that you will think about them for a moment.

I object to your modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection to the original request?

Mr. TOOMEY. Reserving the right to object, this is an amazing argument that the Senator from Illinois is making. He is saying: Don't worry. He would never do what the Senator from Pennsylvania is suggesting might happen and which, by the way, always used to happen, and, which, by the way, the President is asking us to do. We would never do it. Oh, but I will object to a requirement that the money actually go where we say it is going to go.

I think that tells us all we need to know. So I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2084

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, it has been a trying year for our Nation. Thankfully, the vaccine has brought so much hope and a semblance of normalcy back to the lives of many Americans.

As families and businesses in Florida and across the United States continue to work hard to recover from the devastation of COVID-19, travel is critical to get our economy fully reopened.

From the beginning of the pandemic, I encouraged everyone to wear a mask as we learned more about this virus, but now the science is clear that broad mask mandates aren't necessary. Unfortunately, the CDC has decided to buck the science when it comes to travel and is still requiring face masks on public transportation.

We have all heard the stories of how this mandate impacts families: a mother and her six children traumatized by being kicked off a flight after her 2-year-old daughter refused to wear a mask; a New Jersey couple forced to deplane because their 2-year-old wouldn't wear a mask; a Colorado mother and their family booted off a flight over fears their 3-year-old son, who has a disability, wouldn't wear a mask; an Orthodox Jewish family kicked off a flight because their 15-month-old baby was not wearing a mask.

You can't make this stuff up. It has made traveling with children nearly impossible. After a year of hardships and being apart from loved ones, these families were denied the ability to reconnect. It is awful and unnecessary. And I hear stories all the time about parents with young children deciding, I am not getting on an airplane because I know I will get kicked off or I might get kicked off.

And to make guidelines even more confusing, you are allowed to remove

your mask to eat and drink. So why is it OK and totally safe to not have a mask while you eat a snack but dangerous to be unmasked any other time?

The CDC itself has been clear that mask mandates aren't needed. You don't have to wear a mask in a restaurant. You don't have to wear a mask in a hotel. You don't have to wear a mask at a school. You don't have to wear a mask in a stadium. So why is the CDC singling out airlines and public transportation? It doesn't make any sense.

This isn't a political argument. In fact, during our Commerce Committee markup of the surface transportation measure last week, both Democrats and Republicans expressed frustration at the continuation of the mask mandate. Republican and Democratic Governors and mayors across the country have followed the science and lifted mask mandates.

Just like the Federal Government should not be in the business of requiring Americans to turn over their vaccination records, the Federal Government should not be mandating citizens wear masks on public transportation.

That is why I introduced the Stop Mandating Additional Requirements for Travel, or SMART Act, which would revoke the Federal requirement for Americans to wear masks on public transportation. Americans should be free to make choices they feel are in the best interest of their own health and the health of their loved ones.

If someone wants to wear a mask, they are absolutely free to do so, but the government has no right to tell them what to do. If an airline or other private company decides it wants to implement a mask policy, so be it. This does not prohibit them from doing so.

I have been clear. Private companies should be able to make decisions that they feel are appropriate for their employees and their customers. And their customer gets to make a decision.

This bill is pure common sense, and I am glad to be joined today by my colleague from Utah, Senator LEE, and he will be speaking after I ask for the consent.

The science just doesn't support keeping the mask mandate in place. We have to listen to the science and work together to move America forward. I know Americans will do the right thing to stay safe, and I hope my colleagues join me in passing this important bill.

Mr. President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on HELP be discharged from further consideration of S. 2084 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, right now,

experts at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention are continuing to update their mask requirements based on the latest developments, including requirements related to travel. They need us to be reinforcing their science-based work to keep people safe, not overruling it.

We cannot pretend this pandemic is over. This virus is still spreading; it is still mutating; it is still costing lives; and it is still leaving survivors with long-haul symptoms. And the new Delta variant is more contagious, more likely to send people to the hospital, and already in our country.

We have made great progress on vaccinations, but there are still people who are not vaccinated, as well as people who cannot yet get vaccinated. We know masks remain a simple, effective way to protect everyone, especially in small crowded spaces—in an airplane, on a bus, or a train.

Getting rid of mask requirements for travel before the experts tell us it is safe to do so is not going to get people to their destinations any faster, and it is not going to end this pandemic any faster. Instead, it will draw things out. It will cost time, and it will cost lives. To get everyone safely through this pandemic, we need to listen to the experts and let them do their jobs; therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I echo the remarks presented by my friend and colleague, the junior Senator from Florida. I agree wholeheartedly with his analysis. I think it is unfortunate that we missed this opportunity to enact meaningful change today, change that is backed up by science.

It was in January of this year that the Centers for Disease Control ordered the mandatory use of masks on planes, trains, buses, and other modes of public transit of every kind everywhere across this country. If Americans failed to comply with this mandate, they risked being fined or even criminally prosecuted.

Six months later, the coronavirus continues with the CDC refusing to recognize its own research that the mandate is no longer defensible. It is now June. The vaccine has been made available for months, COVID cases are plummeting, and the country is anxious to return to the way things once were. The CDC has even said that vaccinated Americans don't have to wear masks and can get their lives back to normal.

More than 45 percent of Americans are now fully vaccinated. States are lifting their restrictions, and in restaurants, stores, and workplaces across the country, it is no longer required, mercifully, to wear a mask. If Americans still want to wear one, they can make that decision for themselves. They are free to do so. But the CDC's requirement that vaccinated individuals—even vaccinated individuals—

must wear masks on all forms of public transit now blatantly contradicts the Agency's own policies and the Agency's own scientific research. It needlessly promotes fear and plays politics with the lives of the American people, not to mention it has imposed absurd expectations and serious consequences on children and families, especially families with children trying to travel.

You see, after the January mandate, the CDC issued a corresponding mandate that exempted only children over the age of 2, in keeping with their original mask-wearing guidance, guidance that is among the most stringent in the world and, I would add, the most unrealistic in the world, when you consider that they require it up to and including children as young as 2 years old.

So what have been some of the results of this guidance? Parents have been kicked off and banned from flights if their small children refuse to wear a mask. For parents of kids with disabilities and many parents of especially small children, compliance has been nearly impossible.

We already know that children, especially young children, are unlikely to contribute to the spread of the virus. What we do not know, however, is what scientific studies, if any at all, the CDC happens to be relying on in reaching this guidance—in reaching the conclusions underlying this guidance.

In fact, several of my colleagues and I sent a letter to the Agency with this very question more than 2 months ago, on April 22, 2021. And now, more than 2 months later, we have yet to receive an answer. It is a very simple question, and we have yet to receive any shred, any semblance, any scintilla of an answer. I find that unacceptable.

If the CDC actually believes its own research, then it should act like it. And if it believes in the vaccines, the very vaccines on which we have spent billions of taxpayer dollars, then it should act consistently and instill confidence in the American people, rather than fear.

And with the vaccine now free and widely available, Americans should be able to weigh the cost of the options before them and choose for themselves whether to receive the vaccine, whether to wear a mask, or whether to take their own precautions free of any mandates imposed by their government.

But if the Federal Government is going to have a say in whether or not there should be a mandate, it should be up to Congress, the sole branch of the Federal Government empowered to enact law and, not coincidentally, the branch elected by and held most accountable to the people at most regular intervals. It should be up to this branch of government, the legislative branch, to enact such a mandate.

To the extent that the CDC issued this mandate, it did so using authority delegated to it from Congress. We, in Congress, did not pass the mask mandate, and we do not have to defer to those bureaucrats who did.

The science—the science shows that wearing masks should not be Federal law, and we should act accordingly. We should, moreover, give Americans some reason to want to be vaccinated. When there is light at the end of the tunnel and when they can see there is some tangible, immediate benefit to them getting vaccinated, they are more likely to do it. If they can safely enter a place of mass transit without a mask, if they choose to do so, many more people will choose to get vaccinated if we give them that benefit or if we at least allow the operators of those modes of transportation to allow people to do that.

We can assert our rightful authority and promote sound science and common sense by supporting the bill introduced by my friend and colleague, Senator SCOTT of Florida. We need this to pass. The American people have suffered through a very, very long COVID winter. It is time for them to be able to make their own choices. That is what we do best as Americans because we believe in freedom.

We also believe that whenever the coercive power of government, especially the coercive power of the Federal Government is exercised, it must do so with the authority of Congress. We should never tacitly acquiesce to the authority of overlords within a bureaucratic Agency who are elected by no one and ultimately accountable only to themselves.

We are in charge here. We make the law. We shouldn't blindly defer to anyone, certainly not the CDC when the CDC ignores its own science.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Utah for his comments. I want to thank his continued commitment always to make sure that we, Congress, handles everything we can. We don't defer constantly to the executive branch in making decisions that we should be making.

This is a simple example of why we should be making this decision. This is following the science, and I am actually shocked that my colleague from the State of Washington does not want to follow the science.

I don't understand why my colleague from the State of Washington wants government to be dictating things. Why do we want to dictate to Americans how to lead their lives? Why does she think that the government—why has the government lifted mandates in States all across the country but not—and why is the CDC fine with every place but public transportation? It just doesn't make any sense.

Americans will do the right thing. It is not our job to dictate, to tell them how to lead their lives. If someone wants to wear a mask, so be it. They should do it, but the government has no right to tell them that they have to wear a mask. If an airline or another private company decides it wants to implement a mask policy, have at it.

We shouldn't prohibit them from wanting to do that, but we should not be dictating this.

So I am disappointed that my colleague from the State of Washington didn't go along, but I think it is important for us to always make sure we are doing the right thing for the American public and, right now, the right thing is eliminate the mask mandate on public transportation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I rise today in support of two critical nominations: Jen Easterly's nomination to be the Director of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency—commonly referred to as CISA—within the Department of Homeland Security, as well as Robin Carnahan to be the Administrator of the General Services Administration, or GSA.

Our country is under attack. Nation-state actors and criminal organizations are relentlessly targeting our government, critical infrastructure, and key industries to infiltrate networks, steal information, conduct espionage, and demand ransom payments.

These cyber attacks pose a serious threat to our national security. As we saw from the SolarWinds hack, as well as the Colonial Pipeline and JBS ransomware attacks, cyber criminals are constantly looking to exploit cyber security vulnerabilities and find the weakest link. We must be vigilant about preventing these attacks, and we need a strong, coordinated approach from across the Federal Government to better secure America's networks. That means the Senate needs to confirm qualified cyber security nominees so that they can get to work immediately.

CISA is the lead domestic Agency for cyber security in the Federal Government. It is responsible for ensuring that Federal Departments and Agencies—our private sector critical infrastructure partners—and the American people have the resources to detect, to withstand, and to respond to cyber attacks. GSA provides a wide range of support to Agencies across the government. One of GSA's key functions is to provide funding and expertise to help Agencies both modernize and secure their IT systems and their networks. We need Senate-confirmed leadership at the top of these critical Agencies, and we need it today.

Ms. Easterly has served for over three decades in the Federal Government and the private sector.

Since 2017, Ms. Easterly has led the operations center for Morgan Stanley's cyber defense strategy. She was also a critical member of the Cyber Solarium Commission, which has made 80 recommendations for cyber deterrence, 25 of which have already become law.

Prior to joining the private sector, Ms. Easterly served as the Special Assistant to the President and Senior Director for Counterterrorism, the Deputy for Counterterrorism at the National Security Agency, and was instrumental in the design and creation of the U.S. Cyber Command.

On top of all of these incredible accomplishments, Ms. Easterly is a two-time recipient of the Bronze Star and retired from the U.S. Army after more than 20 years of service in intelligence in cyber operations.

Ms. Easterly is more than qualified for this position, and this body needs to confirm her nomination today to lead CISA.

Every day that this body delays confirming critical leaders like Ms. Easterly and Ms. Carnahan leaves our Federal system and our Nation vulnerable to cyber attacks. We have already seen the damage and the chaos from these attacks. The Colonial Pipeline attack disrupted the lives of millions of Americans, created fuel shortages, and saddled customers with high gas prices for weeks. The next major breach could be even worse.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting Ms. Easterly's nomination to lead CISA and to take on the vital mission of strengthening our defenses and fighting back against the persistent cyber attacks that threaten our Nation each and every day. Cyber security and strengthening our Federal networks are not partisan issues. Cyber attacks put each and every one of us at risk.

I would hope my colleagues will allow these nominees to be confirmed today so they can keep us safe.

With that, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 176, Jen Easterly, of New York, to be Director of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, Department of Homeland Security, and the Senate vote on the nomination without intervening action or debate.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Reserving the right to object, I want to make one thing very clear. I am here today to ensure accountability to the American people.

I voted to support Ms. Easterly's confirmation in committee last week, and if Senator SCHUMER filed for cloture, like he has done for dozens of other nominees this year, I would vote to support her confirmation here on the Senate floor. This isn't about Ms. Easterly. This isn't about cyber security. Remember, we unanimously confirmed the National Cyber Director just last week.

I am here today because families in my State of Florida and across our Nation deserve accountability, and Presi-

dent Biden has shown a total lack of accountability when it comes to addressing the border crisis. That is why I announced last month that I would be holding all of President Biden's nominees for the Department of Homeland Security from being approved through our expedited process until he and Vice President HARRIS visit the border and they see for themselves the crisis their failed policies of open borders and amnesty have created.

I understand the White House has just announced that Vice President HARRIS will be visiting the border later this week. I hope that is true. The administration has made a lot of promises that they haven't kept, like not raising taxes, reopening schools quickly, being tough on Communist China—the list goes on and on.

Trust me, I am glad the Vice President seems to be taking my advice and finally listening to the American people. I truly hope that she gets down to the border to see the crisis firsthand that her administration and their failed policies have created.

I hope she meets with the National Border Patrol Council and hears from them what our brave CBP agents are going through every day to keep us safe.

I hope she meets with border community sheriffs who are responsible for keeping our families safe.

I hope she meets with ICE and CBP section chiefs so she can hear firsthand the impact on them.

I hope she takes an aerial tour, like I did, and sees the gaps in the wall.

I hope she sees where the lights and cameras are sitting powerless, without electricity, and unable to be used to monitor our border.

I hope she meets with families who have been the victims of trafficking and hears the horrific stories they have and what they have been through because of this crisis.

I hope she visits border communities that have been put in a position to house and care for the historic number of people illegally crossing our border.

I hope she talks with families who have tragically lost loved ones from the massive amounts of fentanyl that the cartels are moving across our border.

I hope she talks to the ranchers impacted by people illegally crossing their lands.

More than anything, I hope this isn't a political stunt. If she truly goes to see this crisis, I will lift all of my holds of DHS political nominees. It is that simple.

What is happening at the border is a crisis; there is simply no other word for it. It has been 3 months since I traveled to the southern border to see exactly how President Biden's open borders and amnesty policies are wreaking havoc. I took a tour with Governor Ducey. We did an aerial tour. What you see is a wall and then all of a sudden, these openings. They intentionally didn't put up the gates.

I remember my colleagues were saying: Oh, we don't need the wall. We have lights and cameras so they can monitor from someplace else.

They are out there; they are just not hooked up to electricity, intentionally. I mean, you can't make this stuff up.

It has been 3 months since I made clear that President Biden and Vice President HARRIS need to get to the border and see the crisis their administration has created. It has been 3 months since they pledged to visit the border. Since then, as you all know—you look at all the numbers—apprehensions at our southern border are at a record high. More than 180,000 illegal aliens tried to cross our southern border last month and were apprehended—the highest in 21 years. This is a crisis. It threatens our national security and the safety of American families. And we don't know how many people we didn't apprehend.

President Biden's immigration policies are putting unaccompanied minors at risk of human trafficking, violence, sexual abuse, and separation from their families. They are leading to an alarming increase in human trafficking and drug smuggling by cartels.

FBI Director Wray said this month that there is "no question" that cartel activity from Mexico is "spilling over" into the United States. We are seeing it here in Florida. I talk to sheriffs. What they are telling me is that unbelievable amounts of fentanyl are coming across the border and getting into our State, putting Florida families in danger. I was down at one lab, and they were telling me that two people died that week from fentanyl.

But instead of securing the border and finishing wall construction projects, President Biden is terminating all of the wall projects. Why would you be doing this?

The inaction by President Biden and Vice President HARRIS is inexcusable. I don't know what they are waiting for. Why can't they acknowledge that a secure border is the best thing for our Nation? If you talk to people around this country, they want a secure border. Why can't they stand up against the radical left and say that open borders are dangerous to American families?

Two weeks ago, the Vice President went to Guatemala and Mexico. While she was there, she was asked by Lester Holt when she was going to go to the border, and she laughed. I mean, this is not a laughing matter. This is a crisis, and people are dying because of this crisis. It should make all of us furious.

People are dying. Children are being exploited, and they are being abandoned in the desert. Earlier this week, two Ecuadorian children—two little girls, 3 and 5 years old—were dropped over a 14-foot section of the border wall. We all saw the pictures. They were abandoned there in the middle of the night, two innocent little girls, just 3 and 5 years old. Can you imagine how terrified they were? I mean, I

think of my daughters. I think of my grandchildren. We all do. We all think, how would our family deal with that? It just breaks your heart.

The Vice President claims the Vice President's trip down to Guatemala and Mexico was to talk about the root cause of immigration. I don't believe that. The Vice President's trip wasn't anything more than a poorly executed political stunt.

President Biden and Vice President HARRIS need to stop avoiding the crisis, stop laughing off this threat, get to the border, and take real steps. As I said, once they actually go to the border and actually see the crisis, I will lift my hold. This is all to make sure they go to the border. But as long as they refuse to help those risking their lives every day to keep us safe, as long as they refuse to visit the border and put an end to the humanitarian crisis they created, I am going to keep my holds on.

Those two little girls and all the people who have been trafficked—they deserve better. The millions of immigrants in our country going through a legal process—they deserve better. Our Border Patrol agents—they deserve better. All American families deserve better. Therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Michigan.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I would like to discuss Ms. Carnahan's qualifications further before asking for consent on her confirmation.

Ms. Carnahan has an extensive career spanning Federal and State government, as well as the private sector. During the Obama administration, she founded and led the State and Local Practice at 18F, a technology consultancy within GSA. In this role, Ms. Carnahan worked with State and local government agencies to improve and modernize their digital services. Prior to her tenure at 18F, Miss Carnahan served as Missouri's secretary of state, where she focused on modernizing IT infrastructure to improve service for hundreds of thousands of customers.

Ms. Carnahan is a nationally recognized government technology leader and in 2017 was named one of the Federal Government's Top Women in Tech.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting Ms. Carnahan's nomination to lead GSA.

From modernizing and securing Federal networks to strengthening supply chain security, GSA plays a critical role in bolstering our national security.

With that, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the following nomination: Calendar 175.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination. The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Robin Carnahan, of Missouri, to be Administrator of General Services.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nomination without intervening action or debate and, if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all without intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Carnahan nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, after months of unnecessary handwringing, Vice President HARRIS has finally announced that she intends to visit the U.S.-Mexico border.

She was, as you will recall, tapped by the President to lead the efforts to stem the current humanitarian crisis back in March. But 3 months in, she has spent more time trying to figure out how to support Central American countries than how to help American law enforcement and community leaders in Texas.

In the absence of any action from the administration—in fact, any acknowledgement of the crisis, at all—the humanitarian crisis has gotten nothing but worse. In March, the first month of her heading up the administration's response, there were 173,000 migrants that crossed our southern border. Then, in April, the number went up to 178,000 and, in May, 180,000 migrants. We are now on track to see the highest number of total yearly border crossings in two decades, according to the Secretary of Homeland Security, Mr. Mayorkas.

At the center of this crisis are unaccompanied children, who are brought to this country by cartels and human smugglers. We know that the migrant children endure a long and dangerous journey to our border, often arriving malnourished, abused, and in critical health. Some of the young girls even arrive pregnant, and we know that many of them have been sexually assaulted en route by these human smugglers who care nothing for their welfare. All they care about is the cold, hard dollar. I have talked to a number of these children and heard them retell their horrific stories about their journey from their home to our border.

Since January, since the time that President Biden and Vice President

HARRIS were inaugurated, more than 65,000 unaccompanied children have entered our country with no parent and no adult guardian, an absolutely devastating figure. These children are then placed with sponsors in the interior of the United States—sometimes a family member, sometimes a complete stranger. Thirty days after these children are placed with their American-based sponsor, not necessarily even an American citizen, a full 20 percent of them don't respond to a phone call or a wellness check when a person associated with the U.S. Government knocks on the door. And we have no idea what happens to these children once they are lost to the system.

The Border Patrol's Rio Grande Valley Sector is the epicenter of this human crisis. Between October and April, that is where nearly half of all unaccompanied children were encountered. In the 3 months since the Vice President has been in charge of this crisis, I have visited the Rio Grande Valley Sector twice. I have spoken with law enforcement, elected officials, and nongovernmental organizations that try to be of assistance to the migrants while they are in the country, and a long list of other people who are trying to do everything in their power to manage this overwhelming number of humanity coming across our border.

On Friday, Vice President HARRIS won't get to speak with these men and women. Why is that? Well, she will be more than 1,000 miles away, down the border from the Border Patrol sector experiencing the worst of this crisis.

I know there are probably folks who are not from Texas who think that the whole border is exactly the same, but that is not true. I had the chance to travel to Tucson with Senator SINEMA, the Senator from Arizona, and I got a chance to observe how different the border is in the Tucson Sector from the Rio Grande Valley, which she traveled with me to see after we left Tucson. But since October, the Rio Grande Valley Sector has encountered nearly three times as many unaccompanied children as the El Paso Sector and more than seven times more family units.

The situation along the entirety of the U.S. border is challenging, to be sure, and El Paso has suffered during the crisis too, no doubt. Law enforcement, nongovernmental organizations, and community leaders in every border sector are struggling to manage the massive surge of migrants.

When asked why she hadn't visited the border yet, the Vice President said she wasn't interested in grand gestures. Yet here she is planning a trip in a way that reflects, again, that she doesn't really fully comprehend the magnitude of the crisis and where it really exists on steroids, which is in the Rio Grande Valley. It is not even fair to say that she is a day late and a dollar short. She is nearly 100 days late and 1,000 miles short.

By ignoring the Rio Grande Valley, the busiest Border Patrol sector along

the U.S.-Texas-Mexico border, the Vice President is shifting the focus away from the most serious problems of the crisis that she has failed to solve or even contribute any constructive ideas to. It won't surprise you to know that during my time in the Senate, because my State does have a 1,200-mile common border with Mexico, I have spent a lot of time listening to and learning from folks who live and work along our border. Our border is a beautiful part of our State, rich in a unique culture and a rich sense of community that you can't find in many parts of the country.

Through no fault of their own, these border communities are being overwhelmed by the sheer number of migrants crossing the border, and the local leaders are beyond frustrated with the failures of the Federal Government to live up to its obligation to provide security along an international border.

The President and Vice President have, I have to acknowledge, verbally encouraged migrants not to come to the United States. But those words mean nothing. They are hollow rhetoric indeed when somebody can simply pick up the phone and call a family member in the United States or watch the evening news and see how easy it is to make your way across the border, not to mention the fact that the human smugglers, the cartels who charge thousands of dollars per head, are whispering in their ear saying: We can get you across the border if you just pay us our fee.

The reality of the situation is we are nearing a breaking point, and the Vice President and President could see that if they were only willing to join me and others who would be more than happy to host them by visiting the Rio Grande Valley. The administration has wasted valuable time that could have been spent addressing the crisis.

This is a crisis in policy. This is not where building an additional physical barrier would stop many of these migrants. Some of that would, and the Border Patrol said it has a part to play, but the truth is many of these migrants are turning themselves over to law enforcement authorities. They are not running away because they have figured out the gaps in our law better than we have.

The administration has wasted valuable time that could have been spent addressing this crisis, and instead, it has just gotten worse. Now the question is, What are they going to do about it? If they are looking for ideas, I am happy to offer a suggestion.

There is already a grassroots plan out there that was built from the bottom up by Senators and Congressmen most familiar with this crisis. Last month, Senator SINEMA, the Senator from Arizona, and I introduced the Bipartisan Border Solutions Act, a straightforward, commonsense way to address this crisis. We have been proud to work with two House Members. The

Presiding Officer knows Congressman CUELLAR from Laredo, TX, along with TONY GONZALES, who represents one of the biggest congressional districts contiguous to the U.S.-Mexico border, and they are our cosponsors in the House.

So a bipartisan, bicameral bill to address the very crisis that Vice President HARRIS and President Biden have been trying to avoid learning more about, at least until now—this legislation has the support, as I said, of Members of both parties and in both Chambers, as well as a diverse range of well-respected organizations. The U.S. Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, the National Border Patrol Council, the National Immigration Forum, and more than a dozen other organizations support this legislation.

I would be more than happy to sit down with the President and the Vice President to discuss our bill, which includes the input of leaders who are dealing with the brunt of the crisis along the border. If the administration truly wants to address this crisis, they need to get serious about how to do so, and a photo op simply will not get the job done.

The Vice President, I think, would be well served and would be serving the people of this country well if she would visit the Rio Grande Valley and listen to the law enforcement, elected officials, NGOs, and other men and women who are doing their best to try to deal with this crisis without much help from the administration.

The administration has wasted too much time already. Now is not the time for another empty gesture.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

NOMINATION OF DEBORAH L. BOARDMAN

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise this afternoon in support of the nomination of U.S. Magistrate Judge Deborah Boardman to be a U.S. district judge for the District of Maryland.

Judge Boardman was favorably reported by the Judiciary Committee on June 10. I have recommended Judge Boardman, along with Senator VAN HOLLEN, to President Biden, and I strongly support her nomination. Judge Boardman was nominated to fill the future vacancy created when Judge Richard Bennett, appointed by President Bush in 2003, announced his intentions to take senior status upon the confirmation of his successor. President Biden nominated Judge Boardman for this position on March 30, and the Judiciary Committee held her confirmation hearing on May 12.

Shortly after the November 2020 Presidential election, I worked with Senator VAN HOLLEN to establish a judicial selection committee in Maryland. We used an open application process with public advertisement and communicated closely with the State, local, and specialty bar associations in Maryland. In particular, we sought out a highly qualified and diverse applicant pool.

Our committee interviewed everyone who submitted an application, which involved several dozen interviews. Senator VAN HOLLEN and I personally interviewed several finalists before making our recommendations to the White House.

I strongly agree with President Biden's request that Senators consider nominating individuals whose legal experiences have been historically underrepresented on the Federal bench, including those who are public defenders, civil rights and legal aid attorneys, and those who represent Americans in every walk of life. Judge Boardman fits that request.

Judge Deborah Boardman was born in Silver Spring, raised in Frederick, and lives in Baltimore. She received a B.A. from Villanova University. After graduating from college, she accepted a Fulbright scholarship to study in Amman, Jordan. She received her J.D. from the University of Virginia School of Law. After law school, she clerked for a Federal judge in the Eastern District of Virginia, known as the "rocket docket" for the speed of its caseload.

Judge Boardman brings tremendous experience to the courtroom as a sitting U.S. magistrate judge in Maryland since 2019, which is the same Federal judicial district in which she would become a district judge, if confirmed by the Senate. She already handles a heavy caseload in our Federal court.

As a magistrate judge, Judge Boardman presides over civil cases by consent of the parties, resolves civil discovery disputes, conducts settlement conferences, and presides over preliminary criminal proceedings. Additionally, she administers the District of Maryland's Social Security appeals docket.

In civil cases before her by consent of the parties, Judge Boardman rules on motions to dismiss, resolves discovery disputes, decides whether a case should proceed to trial, and presides over bench and jury trials. These cases have involved claims of unemployment discrimination in violation of title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Americans With Disabilities Act, the Rehabilitation Act; claims under 42 United States Code 1983, the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act; qualified and sovereign immunity defenses; and State law claims stemming from contract disputes and personal injuries.

As you can see, she has broad experience in regards to her tenure as a magistrate judge. She has previously served as the First Assistant Federal Public Defender of Maryland. During her 11-year tenure with the Federal Defender's Office, Judge Boardman represented individuals in both the Greenbelt and Baltimore courthouses that were charged with Federal crimes.

She also has experience in private practice, as she served as a litigation associate at Hogan Lovells, formerly known as Hogan & Hartson, in Washington, DC, from 2001 to 2008. During

those years, Judge Boardman worked exclusively on civil matters. She has experience both on the civil side and criminal side. She represented a wide range of corporate and individual clients in State and Federal courts. Specifically, she counseled insurance companies, universities, and healthcare and pharmaceutical companies, among others, in business and contract disputes.

As a fifth-year associate, the firm selected Judge Boardman to serve as the senior pro bono associate in its nationally recognized pro bono department. She managed the firm's largest pro bono cases full-time and appeared in Federal and State courts as the lead attorney in several of these pro bono cases.

She tried a wrongful eviction action before a DC jury. She was lead counsel on a 3-day evidentiary hearing on habeas corpus petitions in the circuit court for the city of Norfolk. She argued numerous discovery motions before the U.S. magistrate judge in the District Court for the District of Columbia in an unemployment discrimination class-action lawsuit.

The American Bar Association's Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary gave Judge Boardman its highest, unanimous "well qualified" recommendation after evaluating her integrity, professional competence, and judicial temperament.

As Judge Boardman said at her confirmation hearing, she is the daughter of the American Revolution on her father's side and a first-generation American of Palestinian descent on her mother's side. Her father was born in New York and was drafted to serve in the U.S. Army in the Vietnam war and then went on to be a successful businessman. Her mother was born in Ramallah, a Palestinian city in the West Bank. She immigrated to the United States in the 1950s with her parents and eight brothers and sisters when she was just 13 years of age. She spoke no English. When she began attending public school in suburban Maryland, she then learned, of course, English and went on to a successful career as a beautician.

Judge Boardman has testified that her parents taught her the value of hard work, the importance of education, the value of family, and the need to be generous to those who are less fortunate in life.

In my discussions and meetings with Judge Boardman, I have some impressions that stand out from her as a person. She is fully committed to public service through her diverse professional career as a lawyer, law firm partner, public defender, and now a U.S. magistrate judge. She regards being a sitting judge as the ultimate and highest calling of public service in the legal profession. She wants to inspire the public's confidence in the judiciary and to hear parties' concerns compassionately, while upholding her duty to fairly apply the law. Now as a

U.S. magistrate judge, Judge Boardman has told me she understands the absolute importance of adjudicating disputes neutrally and fairly.

She clearly has the temperament for this position. She has told me that she is naturally curious and tries to avoid making assumptions.

Judge Boardman shared with me that her internal compass directed her toward service. Judges are first and foremost public servants, but they hold certain powers over individuals' lives. She understands that. In her view, a district court judgeship is much more than achievement; it is a serious public responsibility which requires a judge to put the public first as they uphold the rule of law.

Numerous individuals wrote to me on Judge Boardman's behalf, including several sitting judges, law firm associates, and colleagues from her service in the public defender's office. They unanimously praise Judge Boardman's courtroom skills as a litigator, in particular praising her courtroom presence, sharp legal and analytical skills in both written and legal advocacy, and her high level of professionalism, excellent temperament, and unfailing courtesy to all parties.

As a person, I have repeatedly been told by those who know her well that Judge Boardman is the best kind of person to be a judge. She is smart, patient, kind, and tough when she needs to be. She is a hard worker. She sees all sides of an argument and is always fair and professional in her treatment of others.

I was delighted to recommend the nomination of Judge Boardman to President Biden, along with Senator VAN HOLLEN. Judicial nominees must meet the highest standard of integrity, competency, and temperament. Judge Boardman will safeguard the rights of all Marylanders and all Americans, uphold the Constitution and rule of law, and faithfully follow the judicial oath to do equal right to the poor and to the rich. I am confident that Judge Boardman will serve the people of Maryland very well once she is confirmed.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the confirmation of Judge Boardman, who is an outstanding judicial nominee from Maryland. She is already a sitting U.S. magistrate judge on the U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland, where she has served with district judges. I look forward to her continued public service to Maryland and to the Nation.

With that, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SMITH). The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as if in morning business for such time as I shall consume.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RETAIN ACT

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, last year, the Federal Communications

Commission approved an application by Ligado Networks to repurpose the Federal spectrum in a way that will drastically interfere with GPS and satellite communications. This a big deal. There are so many people who understand this situation. There is a list of companies behind us that grows every day. Almost every company in America that you know of or have heard of—their name is on this list.

The decision that was made will threaten GPS and satellite communications reliability for millions of Americans who depend on it. The reliability of GPS and satellite communications is necessary for safety of life operations, national security, and economic activity.

I am going to pause here for a minute to drive home what this actually means for every American because people don't know this. They don't know how important GPS is. Yet there is not an American I can think of by description who isn't using it every day. So if something happens to it, there is a serious problem. Here are some of the day-to-day activities that would be difficult when experiencing GPS interference from Ligado.

A big one—using your credit card or your debit card. When you are making a purchase or using an ATM, our financial systems rely on GPS timing in order to work.

Another one—making a phone call. Cell phone networks rely on GPS to synchronize cell towers so calls can be passed seamlessly. If they experience interference, your call could be dropped when moving from one tower to another.

Another one that people are not aware of and don't expect is energy, whether that is filling up your tank with gas at the pump or electrical grids to light our homes. We rely on GPS timing to safely operate underground pipelines and our electricity grid.

Farmers and ranchers—this is something that a lot of people are not aware of, but they depend on GPS and satellite communications when planting crops, applying fertilizer, and during harvesting operations to move large and critical machinery with precision.

Working out—a lot of people don't. I don't as much as I used to, but a lot of people do. They say that one-fifth of the population, 20 percent of the population, of all Americans, use a fitness tracker or a smartwatch. The majority have used GPS to count steps to track distance. We all know that. You see them out there every day. They depend on GPS.

Taking a flight—I have been involved in aviation for over 70 years now and had occasion with three friends to fly around the world in 1991 using GPS. At that time—it may have been the first—the equipment I used was a Trimble TNL 2000. Trimble is one of the big GPS companies. I was using one, the TNL 2000. At that time, that may have been—we are checking to see—the first time that had been used for private

aviation, flying all the way around the world. Again, that is GPS, and that was 1991.

Driving around right now, each day, countless Americans rely on Google Maps, Waze, Apple Maps, and any other navigation system to get them from point A to point B. While no one hopes to ever need a firetruck or an ambulance or the 9-1-1 operators, the EMS, they use GPS on a daily basis.

There is more—weather forecasting, the movement of goods on our highways, surveying maritime harbors, channels, and everything else. The list goes on and on.

How do we know that Ligado will cause interference? The FCC told us when they approved the Ligado order. I will read that now because people need to understand. I guess you could say we were warned.

The FCC said in their document—that was the document they used on their approval order. They said:

Ligado shall expeditiously repair or replace as needed any U.S. Government GPS devices that experience or are likely to experience harmful interference from Ligado's operations.

That is a quote. That is what they said. That is what the FCC said at that time.

Over 21 organizations and companies and industries filed petitions for reconsideration after the order was released, documenting the damage they would face from the Ligado interference. This thing right behind me is now up to 82; it was 78 this morning. The list goes on and on. You can hardly think of a corporation in America that isn't on this list. So it is something that is a very serious problem and widespread.

Here is one way to put the interference into perspective. Because GPS signals travel from satellite in space, by the time those signals get to Earth's surface, they are low power. Because the FCC order allows Ligado to repurpose spectrum to operate a terrestrial-based network, Ligado's signals on Earth's surface will be much more powerful than GPS, causing substantial and harmful interference.

While the FCC required Ligado to repair damage to Federal Agencies that results from the interference, congressional action is needed because the FCC's Ligado order fell short in two important ways.

First, the order did not provide an adequate description of costs to the Federal Agencies that would result from Ligado's interference.

We took bipartisan steps to correct this last year in the NDAA.

The NDAA is the largest bill of the year. I happen to have been for several years the chairman of this thing. The NDAA is the national defense authorization bill. It does all the things that we do in the military. So that is the bill we are talking about.

We included in that bill a provision directing the Department of Defense to produce an estimate of damages and costs associated with the harmful in-

terference to GPS. We also directed DOD—Department of Defense—and the National Academy of Sciences to conduct an independent technical review of the harmful interference that Ligado can cause.

Secondly, the FCC failed to require that Ligado bear the costs of interference in State governments or pay for interference to devices owned by individual users. Now, we are talking about all Americans out there now—not just government, not State government, not Federal government, but everyone else, these individual users. I talked already about how many ways we rely on GPS in everyday life. None of that would be protected from interference under the existing Ligado order.

That is why I am introducing legislation—it is a long name, but I am going to say it anyway. It is called the Recognizing and Ensuring Taxpayer Access to Infrastructure Necessary for GPS and Satellite Communications Act, 2021. Got that? All right. I call it the RETAIN Act. That is a little more accurate and easy to understand.

My legislation ensures that Federal Agencies, State governments, and all others negatively impacted by the actions of a private actor are not left holding the bag when it comes to costs, the amount of money it would cost to rectify, and, worse, aren't put in a position where they have to push the costs onto the American consumers.

Why is this legislation necessary? Reliable GPS and satellite communications are important to everyone in the world and drive much of the Nation's economy. That is why I am going to ask my colleagues to embrace, endorse, and cosponsor this legislation. Otherwise, others may be forced to pay for damage that is done by the system.

Anyway, I am going to ask our colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this legislation. If we don't do this and something happens, then it will be paid for not by those responsible parties but by the taxpayers.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from New York.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1520

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. As if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the majority leader in consultation with the Republican leader, the Senate Armed Services Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 1520 and the Senate proceed to its consideration; that there be 2 hours of debate, equally divided in the usual form, and that upon the use or yielding back of that time, the Senate vote on

the bill with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. INHOFE. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. I rise for the 14th time to call for every Senator to have the opportunity to consider and cast their vote on the Military Justice Improvement and Increasing Prevention Act, which would ensure that servicemembers who have been subject to sexual assault and other serious crimes get the justice they deserve.

For nearly a decade, the DOD has argued that removing convening authority from command, as our bill does, would undermine military readiness and good order and discipline. But yesterday, our Secretary of Defense Secretary Lloyd Austin endorsed the Independent Review Commission's recommendation that sexual assault and related crimes be moved from the chain of command to trained military prosecutors.

It is historic. It is historic that we have, for the first time ever, a Secretary of Defense agreeing that good order and discipline does not rest on a commander deciding whether a case goes forward or not.

But we have to remember that the limited changes he endorsed come from a panel that was only asked to look at one type of crime. They were specifically asked to look at ways to solve the problem of military sexual assault and harassment. They drilled down on those issues of sexual assault, sexual harassment, domestic violence, and child abuse, and they agreed that all of those crimes must be taken out of the chain of command and put in the hands of specialized, highly trained military prosecutors. They see no conflict with making those changes and retaining command control.

I remind my colleagues the mission we are tasked with is larger than the mission that the IRC was tasked with. Our job is to provide our servicemembers with a military justice system that is worthy of the sacrifices they make for our country every day. That is why our bill addresses the fundamental flaw in the military justice system that puts the fate of our servicemembers in the hands of commanders who often know both the accuser and the accused and are not trained lawyers.

Our reform draws a bright line and moves all serious crimes, which can lead to serious consequences, to independent military prosecutors.

Secretary Austin's endorsement of the IRC's reforms makes it clear that he understands what we understand—convening authority is not necessary for maintaining command control or

for maintaining good order and discipline. Right now, 97 percent of commanders maintain good order and discipline without having convening authority for general court-martial. Only 3 percent, level 06 and above, have that unique authority.

Our allies have drawn a similar bright line. They decided that in their military, serious crimes should be taken out of the chain of command and given to trained prosecutors. They have told us, through letters and testimony, that they saw no diminution in command control or good order and discipline.

Good order and discipline rests not on the commander's ability to act as judge and jury but on their ability to do their job of instilling a culture of respect between servicemembers and instilling a command climate where these types of actions aren't tolerated.

There is no reason to continue to subject servicemembers to a system where commanders, rather than trained military prosecutors, are deciding which cases go to trial. We must move decisions about whether to move forward on cases dealing with serious crimes to the most qualified, most highly trained person. That would be trained military prosecutors. That is all that our bill does. That is what the Military Justice Improvement and Increasing Prevention Act does.

In addition to having a filibuster-proof support in the Senate, this is now a bipartisan, bicameral piece of legislation. This morning, I stood with Congresswoman SPEIER, Speaker PELOSI, Congressman TURNER, and a bipartisan group of Members in the House as they introduced this version of the legislation. The bipartisan support we have in the House includes Republicans with years of military service—former JAGs, former commanders. We had a general from the Republican Party stand up and support that bill this morning.

Not only do they understand the importance of having a military justice system that is impartial and highly trained but also the importance of command and what their role is. We have a great deal of bipartisan support.

This type of bipartisan, bicameral support is rare. It speaks to the importance of this reform, the importance of us meeting our obligation to provide oversight of our military, and the importance of serving those who serve our country in uniform.

This morning, we were also joined by the sisters of Vanessa Guillen. Her youngest sister Lupe talked about what happened to Vanessa. She said: "The system that we have now failed my sister, [and] it's up to us to change [it]."

To change the system that failed Vanessa, moving just sex crimes out of the chain of command would not be enough. She was murdered. We must move all serious crimes, including murder, to independent, impartial military prosecutors.

This morning, Lupe said: "Someone will always have to suffer for someone to care—but that stops now and it stops with us."

It is time for us to do the job right, to prove Lupe right. Our servicemembers, as Secretary Austin said, deserve nothing less.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FILIBUSTER

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, earlier this week—in fact, yesterday—the Senate Democrats attempted an unprecedented power grab in the Senate that, in my view, clearly would have affected the sanctity of our elections and violated our Constitution.

S. 1 was one of the most monstrous bills I have seen during my time in Congress, and it certainly didn't meet my standard of doing things that are constitutional.

In doing so yesterday, the Senate Democrats underscored for me something I thought I knew well, and they reaffirmed it, and that is the importance of maintaining the legislative filibuster, the 60-vote threshold for legislation.

I am sorry we went down the path of changing the rules for judges, then for the Supreme Court, and now, potentially, for legislation. Sixty votes is a good thing. Sixty votes allow—people say they want us to work together—60 votes require us to do that. In the absence of 60-vote rule, everything becomes political. In the absence of 60-vote rule, there is no certainty.

A party in power, one that has the majority of the Senate, the President—the election changes, and there is a new majority, and then we change what we just passed 2 years before. There is nothing good for job creation and economic security. There is nothing good for families and trying to figure out what is next in their life when the law can change every time a new, a different party has the majority in the U.S. Senate and House or there is a new President.

My view is that what happened yesterday was not by design. As a matter of fact, the vote, among others, was designed to fail in order to pressure Democratic Senators into altering the rules of the Senate and render this place a majority-run institution.

Democrats achieved control—the voters gave them control of both Chambers of the Congress and the White House—and are convinced that they have a mandate to erode the governing norms of the Senate. By my count, the Senate stands at an evenly divided, 50–50, and the majority, by a slight number, Democrats have in the House of Representatives. Surely, this is hardly

a mandate for a radically progressive agenda, much less changing the threshold for which minority rights are protected and bipartisan cooperation is promoted.

Should the legislative filibuster meet its demise at the hands of this Senate because Democrats decide on a majority vote, that the rules that have been in place for decades should be changed overnight on a whim, the august U.S. Senate will be condemned to a partisan spectacle.

The idea that everything should be decided by one vote means that everything here becomes political and that the American people become even more partisan. If every vote in the U.S. Senate—every outcome—is determined by one person, then politics become the passion of the American people by necessity. The 60-vote rule is designed to moderate both sides of a question, to bring us together, to pull us to the middle in something that is more acceptable to the American people than anything we might decide if we could decide it on our own, Republican or Democrat. It means that every citizen would feel the need to lobby us.

The normal course of life becomes much more about politics. While politics is important to the country and while it is important for the American people to be engaged, they send us here to make decisions. That 60-vote rule allows us to make decisions that are more acceptable to them so they can spend their lives living their lives, not worrying about what, on any given day, the U.S. Senate might pass.

I don't think the motivation by the Senate Democrats is what it may seem to some. The suggestion is that we can't seem to pass any legislation here. I read this week in the Wall Street Journal an editorial, an op-ed piece, by Mike Solon and Bill Greene, and this was a comment that stood out to me:

The movement to end the filibuster is less about a Senate that doesn't work than it is about a socialist agenda that doesn't sell.

The idea that everything is decided on the margin of one means that we become politics, that politics rules in this country. The freedoms and liberties that the American people enjoy every day because they can rely on not radical change but modest change—on improvements day by day, not improvements overnight—means that we have a different country. We certainly would have a different Senate, but a consequence of having a different Senate means America is not what it is today.

Again, I say this in a way that would, I hope, remind my colleagues on both sides of the aisle: I stand ready to work on many issues on which we can bring ourselves together. I hope this week—tomorrow, today—that we learn there is an infrastructure agreement, a bipartisan agreement. This isn't a belief that I have the ability to dominate the agenda of the U.S. Senate or that one party should. It is a reminder that America is better when we work together and that eliminating the 60-vote

rule, ending the filibuster, changes America for the worse.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the scheduled vote proceed immediately.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOTE ON BOARDMAN NOMINATION

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Boardman nomination?

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 248 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Baldwin	Heinrich	Reed
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Blumenthal	Hirono	Sanders
Booker	Kaine	Schatz
Brown	Kelly	Schumer
Cantwell	King	Shaheen
Cardin	Klobuchar	Sinema
Carper	Leahy	Smith
Casey	Lujan	Stabenow
Collins	Manchin	Tester
Coons	Markey	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Warner
Duckworth	Merkley	Warnock
Durbin	Murphy	Warren
Feinstein	Murray	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Wyden
Graham	Padilla	
Hassan	Peters	

NAYS—48

Barrasso	Grassley	Portman
Blackburn	Hagerty	Risch
Blunt	Hawley	Romney
Boozman	Hoeven	Rounds
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Burr	Inhofe	Sasse
Capito	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Lankford	Shelby
Cotton	Lee	Sullivan
Cramer	Lummis	Thune
Crapo	Marshall	Tillis
Cruz	McConnell	Toomey
Daines	Moran	Tuberville
Ernst	Murkowski	Wicker
Fischer	Paul	Young

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OSSOFF). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 128,

Candace Jackson-Akiwumi, of Illinois, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Tina Smith, Sherrod Brown, Jon Ossoff, Alex Padilla, Jacky Rosen, Tammy Duckworth, Brian Schatz, Chris Van Hollen, Catherine Cortez Masto, Robert Menendez, Richard Blumenthal, Patty Murray, Martin Heinrich, Michael F. Bennet, Sheldon Whitehouse.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Candace Jackson-Akiwumi, of Illinois, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 53, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 249 Ex.]

YEAS—53

Baldwin	Heinrich	Peters
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Reed
Blumenthal	Hirono	Rosen
Booker	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	Kelly	Schatz
Cantwell	King	Schumer
Cardin	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Carper	Leahy	Sinema
Casey	Lujan	Smith
Collins	Manchin	Stabenow
Coons	Markey	Tester
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murkowski	Warnock
Feinstein	Murphy	Warren
Gillibrand	Murray	Whitehouse
Graham	Ossoff	Wyden
Hassan	Padilla	

NAYS—47

Barrasso	Grassley	Risch
Blackburn	Hagerty	Romney
Blunt	Hawley	Rounds
Boozman	Hoeven	Rubio
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Burr	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Capito	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Kennedy	Shelby
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cotton	Lee	Thune
Cramer	Lummis	Tillis
Crapo	Marshall	Toomey
Cruz	McConnell	Tuberville
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Paul	Young
Fischer	Portman	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KELLY). On this vote, the yeas are 53, the nays are 47.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Candace Jackson-Akiwumi, of Illinois, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

FILIBUSTER

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, my State proudly calls itself the Land of Steady Habits. Some people in Con-

necticut think it is kind of a funny thing to be proud of—being resistant to change—but honestly, in the Northeast, in the crucible of America, we know there is real value to consistency and tradition.

A nation as unique as ours—multicultural, democratic, ever expanding in scope and ambition—we probably can't hold together unless there is some agreement between all of our different peoples about the expectations that we have for each other in the conduct of our national business. Without tradition, our Nation's defining dynamism, it might break us.

Yes, it is wildly old-fashioned to hold town meetings, where every citizen has to show up on one particular day, to make decisions about how you spend money or what rates you pay in taxes, but that way of governing, created in New England some four centuries ago, is still the method of decisionmaking in many of our towns. It may not be the most efficient means of government, but tradition matters. It helps to hold us together as a country.

I know and appreciate the value of consistency. I don't deny it. So earlier this week, I read with interest an opinion piece, penned by one of my friends in the Senate Democratic caucus, making the argument that amongst the most important reasons to preserve the 60-vote threshold in the Senate is to advance the value of consistency and tradition in American politics.

I was glad to read it. I am proud of my colleague because for too long, the punditry and the activists have had near exclusive domain over the debate about the wisdom of changing the rules of this body. So it has been strange, given how much this place means to the 100 of us who serve here, that we have mostly left the dialogue over its future to those who don't work inside this Chamber every day.

Yes, right now, there is a disagreement amongst Senate Democrats and between the majority of Senate Democrats and the majority of Senate Republicans about how the Senate should operate, but there is no merit in hiding this dispute. There is no valor in letting others define the terms that lay out the conflicting arguments, which I readily submit are compelling on both sides. So let's have the debate. Let's have it right here. No more shadow-boxing. The stakes, I would argue, are too important.

Let me start here. The argument to keep the 60-vote threshold, to guarantee policy consistency or to uphold Senate tradition, is downright dangerous because this argument essentially prioritizes consistency over democracy.

At the very moment when Americans have less faith than ever before that this place has the capacity to implement the will of the people, the 60-vote threshold is a slap in the face of majoritarianism, which is the bedrock principal of American democracy, the idea that the majority of people get to

decide the direction of this country—not elites, not oligarchs, like in other nations; people, regular people.

To say that Americans can have an election, choose leaders of a particular view, and then watch while the rules of democracy deliberately stop the voters' will from being enacted is to thumb our noses at the American electorate—at the very moment when they are actively considering whether American democracy has anything left to offer them.

My colleague argues quite powerfully that the requirement to achieve 60 votes to pass legislation in the Senate guards against rapid policy change, giving several examples, including education and environment policy and voting rules as areas where danger might lie if one majority imposed the policy in one Congress that would be undone by the next. I want to walk us through this argument.

My first approach might be to postpone the harder question of whether or not to value consistency over democracy and to simply accept for a moment the prioritization of consistency and tradition. I do so knowing that our Founding Fathers also prioritized consistency.

In Federalist 9 and 10, Hamilton and Madison discuss what they call the problem of factions. Madison says that a faction is “a number of citizens, whether amounting to a minority or majority of the whole, who are united and actuated by some common impulse of passion, adverse to the rights of other citizens.” Now, notice here that Madison doesn't really care whether the faction represents a minority or majority of citizens; he simply defines it by its cause's malevolence. This was and still is tricky business—rich White men defining for everybody else what cause is righteous and which cause is wicked. But our Founding Fathers built a system of government to make rapid policy change—even change supported by the majority of voters—very, very hard to implement.

Now, how do they do this? I want to lay this out because if you do care about preventing rapid policy shifts, it is important to understand why the 60-vote threshold isn't necessary, is overkill given all the other barriers our system has to prevent rapid policy shifts.

First, our Founding Fathers established a bicameral legislature as opposed to a unicameral parliamentary system. That meant that no change could be implemented until two different legislative bodies agreed to the exact same text.

Second, they layered on top of that bicameral legislative structure a unitary President with the power to veto that legislation.

Third, they put in place an unelected body, the Supreme Court, that could invalidate any statutory changes that conflicted with the Constitution.

Fourth, they put the House and the Senate and the Presidency all on over-

lapping, conflicting election schedules, guaranteeing that it would be 100 percent possible for the voters to sweep out all elected officials and replace them with a new slate all at one moment.

Fifth, the Founders built a few super-majority requirements but only for selective occasions: treaties, impeachments, constitutional amendments—the stuff that could last forever. The Founding Fathers did want extra consensus around that.

All of that design has lasted. It is still with us today.

There are other parts of the original design intended to protect the value of consistency to protect against the danger of faction that have not lasted. The Founders also believed that only White men should vote and that citizens shouldn't be trusted to directly select the Members of this body. That is all history because for all of the anti-faction design that we have kept, we changed just as much, and all of that change has moved in only one direction—toward more majoritarian democracy.

Why? Well, because as our grand experiment—the American experiment—matured, we saw proof of concept. The people could be trusted to govern themselves. They could choose leaders who were more able, more honest, more effective than any King or Queen, any Sultan or Emperor. So we extended the franchise universally. We directly elected the Senate.

As America expanded, the new States out West gobbled up even more democracy. The West decided to not just elect legislators but judges, prosecutors, dog catchers and commissioners. Majoritarian rule became addictive, and our country grew and it demanded more and more of it.

That brings us to the 60-vote threshold. The 60-vote threshold in a country built on the strength of direct democracy stands out like a sore, rotting thumb—this anti-majoritarian drain clog designed intentionally to stop the majority of Americans from getting what they want from government.

Proponents of existing Senate rules say that in the name of bipartisanship or tradition or consistency of policy, we should purposefully frustrate the changing will of the electorate. But why? Why not trust voters? For instance, voters elected a President and a Congress in 2008 that promised to enact a system of universal healthcare. It just so happened that at that moment, for the first time in 40 years, there were 60 votes for the party of that view in the Senate, so a universal healthcare law was passed.

But why should it not be up to the voters and not politicians to review the efficacy of a major policy change like that and, if they so choose, elect leaders to rescind or revise it? I don't want the ACA repealed, but I am deeply uncomfortable that a 60-vote threshold robs from voters that decision.

This preference for policy consistency, intentionally blind to the merits

of policy over direct democracy, is particularly insidious at this moment in American history, first because the 60-vote threshold is being used in a very, very different way today than it has anytime prior in our Nation's history.

Up until the 1970s, cloture votes were almost nonexistent in the Senate. Legislative filibusters were used in those days mostly by racist southern White Senators to stop civil rights bills. Beginning in the seventies, that tactic became more widely employed but was still used sparingly.

Consider this. In 1994, our colleague Senator FEINSTEIN forced a vote on one of the most controversial of all proposals that come before this body—a ban on assault weapons. It received fewer votes than the Manchin-Toomey background check bill did 30 years later. Senator FEINSTEIN's proposal got 52 votes; Manchin-Toomey got 54 votes. But the assault weapons ban became law while the background checks bill did not. Why? Because in 1994, many important votes, even the assault weapons ban, were allowed to proceed on a majority-vote basis. Not so by 2013.

I could make the argument that it was Republicans who started this rapid escalation of the use of the 60-vote threshold, but who really cares? It doesn't matter because today both parties use it almost without exception in a way that looks radically different from the way the tactic was utilized half a century ago.

I would argue that if you want to do an overview of the history of the 60-vote threshold, it doesn't tell a story of the value the Senate places on consistency. No, it is the opposite. Watching the way the tactic has been used so differently over time, it demonstrates the value the Senate places on change in practice and tradition. Reforming this rule would, frankly, just pay heed to this reality.

The second danger of valuing consistency over democracy at this moment lies in the signal that it sends to an American public that is in, frankly, no mood for the choices of the elites to be continually substituted for their own collective judgment.

Right now, Americans are in kind of a revolutionary mood, and for good reason. More Americans today than at any time in recent history see themselves on the precipice of financial and sometimes spiritual ruin. They are done with economic and political elites jealously protecting the status quo. And the election of Donald Trump, although revealed by time to be a false prophet, was an unmistakable foot stomp by an electorate tired of being taken for granted.

So why on Earth would our message, amidst this growing populist tempest, be to tell voters that rules in the Senate are required to protect them from their own bad judgment, to take from them, purposely, the ability to change policies whenever and however they wish?

I submit to you that today, right now, this replacement of popular will by anti-majoritarian rule-rigging could destroy us. Today more than ever, voters want to know that their vote counts every election. And continuing to give minorities here in the Senate power to stop change is dangerously dissonant with the current political mood of this country. Take power away from the American people at your peril.

Finally, on this question of the value we should place on consistency, I want to raise the problem of the city firehouse. Firehouses are places that value consistency and tradition. Firefighters spend a lot of time in close quarters together. When that alarm rings, they are required to work together in precise and disciplined unison to get out the door in seconds in order to save lives and property. Practices change in a firehouse but carefully and through consensus decision making. Keeping everybody together matters when the stakes are so high.

But what would happen if inside that firehouse, a sizable group of firefighters decided one day that the mission of the department should no longer be to put out fires but maybe, instead, just to let them burn a little? Wouldn't then the value of consensus decision making become a little less important? If you were a homeowner, wouldn't you want to make sure that the firefighters who still wanted to fight fires were setting the rules and not the guys who are OK with the houses in the neighborhood burning down?

I know this is a crude analogy, but to value consistency or tradition above everything else, I think you have to be pretty certain that everybody in your club, everybody on your team is guided by the same foundational goal.

In the case of the U.S. Senate, our goal, our endgame has always been simple: the preservation of American democracy, the belief that every American should have a say in who governs, and the persons whom they choose and no one else should be seated in power.

We have had fights—often vicious in nature—over the course of our Nation's history over how fast we should expand the vote, how quickly we should reform our Constitution to allow for more direct democracy. But never before has one party actively advocated for the lessening of democracy. Never before has one party openly advocated for candidates who receive the smaller share of the vote to be made President of the United States.

In the last year, a democratic Rubicon has been crossed by one party, and we can't ignore this devastating blow to our Nation. You cannot value consistency in practice when a large faction of your group's members don't believe in the underlying mission of your organization any longer. The firehouse can't just keep doing the same things it always does year after year for the sake of consistency or tradition or con-

sensus when two or three of the members who hop on the firetruck when that alarm sounds aren't intending to actually put out the fire when they arrive at the building.

Giving Republicans a veto power over legislation when they no longer believe in the same way the Democrats do or Republicans used to in the sacredness of the vote is to risk the voluntary destruction of our democracy.

Consistency as a value has merit. It does. But in this business, consistency is often put on an unhealthy pedestal. What is the value of being consistent when all of the circumstances around you are changing? Where is the strength in sticking to your position when everything around you is in metamorphosis? When democracy itself is being attacked in a brutal, coordinated, unprecedented volley of blows, what is the good of holding to a position just for the sake of being consistent if the primary consequence is to simply green light the assault to continue?

Consistency and tradition and bipartisanship—they matter but not at the expense of democracy, not in a moment when millions of voters are questioning the wisdom of American democracy because no matter whom they elect, nothing seems to change, and not when one party has increasingly abandoned the joint project to which all Members of this body swore an oath as a condition of our membership.

I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I know Senator MARSHALL is ready to speak, and I apologize for delaying him with my rather long remarks.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session and be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SESQUICENTENNIAL OF CALVERT CITY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, for 150 years, Calvert City has been a central hub of the Jackson Purchase, serving as a focal point for pioneers, farmers, and railroaders from all over western Kentucky. The town's enduring legacy is a tribute to the enterprising demeanor of those trailblazing Kentuckians who first called the Purchase home. In recognition of Calvert City's sesquicentennial, I am privileged to join this vibrant Kentucky community in celebrating 150 years of Bluegrass heritage.

Calvert City started off as nothing more than a depot alongside the Paducah & Elizabethtown Railroad, but

quickly blossomed as settlers spread west into the Jackson Purchase to profit from the region's fertile soil and easy access to the Tennessee, Cumberland, Ohio, and Mississippi Rivers. By the time the Kentucky Dam was completed nearby in 1944, bringing jobs and hydroelectric power to the region, the town was a flourishing center of commerce. Today, Calvert City is home to numerous advanced chemical manufacturing facilities and continues to play a critical role in western Kentucky's economy.

In recognition of Calvert City's pioneer spirit, the town is celebrating 150 years of history with 150 events throughout the calendar year. These ceremonies are made especially poignant by the passing of Mayor Lynn Boyd Jones this January. He had dreamed about Calvert City's 150th anniversary since the town's centennial 50 years ago and was an early planner of this year's festivities.

As Kentucky emerges from the COVID-19 pandemic, the celebration will be a uniquely joyous tribute. All aspects of Calvert City's storied history will be on display, from railroad cars, to an auto show, to events at Oak Hill, the original home of town founder Potilla Calvert.

I want to give special thanks to the Calvert City civic leaders who made this year's sesquicentennial celebration possible. It is through their hard work and dedication that the town continues to prosper, so many years after its founding. On behalf of the Senate, I share our congratulations with every Calvert City family and join them in honoring 150 years of proud Kentucky traditions.

LGBTQ PRIDE MONTH

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise in recognition of LGBTQ Pride Month of 2021. For more than 50 years, Pride Month has offered us a chance to celebrate lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer—LGBTQ—Americans and to reflect upon the progress that our Nation has made in how we treat this community in law, policy, custom, and everyday life. It also is an opportunity to redouble our efforts to end enduring discrimination based on sexual orientation or gender identity.

President Biden promptly issued a Presidential proclamation recognizing June of 2021 as Pride Month. With the authorization of Secretary of State Antony Blinken, U.S. diplomatic missions around the world are displaying the pride flag as a clear visual representation of American values. On the very first day of his administration, President Biden issued an executive order on preventing and combating discrimination based on gender identity or sexual orientation. This decision has already driven new policies at the agency level making an important difference in real people's lives, from protecting transgender individuals seeking safe shelter to reversing the

Trump-era ban that prohibited transgender people from serving in the military. It is clear that LGBTQ Americans can count on the Biden-Harris administration to do everything possible to champion fundamental human rights on their behalf.

The bad news is that while we see progress at a Federal level, the Human Rights Campaign assesses that 2021 is the worst year in terms of State-level anti-LGBTQ legislation in recent history. Governors have signed 17 anti-LGBTQ bills into law, already exceeding the 15 anti-LGBTQ laws passed in 2015, which held the previous record in recent history. There are even more bills waiting Governors' signatures or veto override votes. Most of these bills shamefully target transgender children. These bills and laws are untethered from trends in real public opinion. Recent polling from Gallup finds that support for same-sex marriage is at a new high of 70 percent of all Americans. A PBS/NPR/Marist poll published in April revealed that two-thirds of all Americans oppose legislation to ban transgender student athletes from joining sports teams that match their gender identity, a number that barely changes across partisan lines.

The American people clearly agree with the principle expressed in President Biden's executive order: "All persons should receive equal treatment under the law, no matter their gender identity or sexual orientation." It is as simple as that.

When it comes to human rights, civil rights, and being treated with dignity and respect, everybody in this country, regardless of where they live, should receive equal treatment. The House of Representatives passed the Equality Act in February to prohibit discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity in education, employment, housing, credit, Federal jury service, public accommodations, and with regard to receiving Federal financial assistance. These protections build upon and align with the Supreme Court's landmark decision 1 year ago in *Bostock vs. Clayton County*, which affirmed that the sex discrimination prohibition in the Civil Rights Act of 1964 also applies to discrimination based on sexual orientation or gender identity. That ruling states, "it is impossible to discriminate against a person for being homosexual or transgender without discriminating against that individual based on sex." We still urgently need to pass the Equality Act, however, to apply this interpretation to all areas of civil rights law and to apply protections against discrimination based on sex, sexual orientation, and gender identity to a broader scope of entities. I am proud to be an original cosponsor of the legislation and will work to advance it this Congress.

As Harvey Milk said, "It takes no compromise to give people their rights. It takes no money to respect the indi-

vidual. It takes no political deal to give people freedom." This Pride Month, I urge my colleagues in the Senate to join me in supporting the Equality Act to ensure that we protect the human and civil rights all Americans. Our government should do all it can to promote equality, compassion, and empathy—not discrimination, bigotry, and hate.

CONFIRMATION OF KIRAN ARJANDAS AHUJA

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I rise to support the nomination of Kiran Ahuja to serve as the Director of the Office of Personnel Management. Mrs. Ahuja is highly qualified and has a deep commitment to public service that will serve her well as the Director of OMB. I am confident that she has the skills to rebuild the civil service and restore protections for civil servants that were rolled back by the Trump administration.

Mrs. Ahuja spent her childhood travelling across the South with her parents as they worked to provide desperately needed mental health services to underserved communities. After graduating from Spelman College and the University of Georgia School of Law, Mrs. Ahuja began her career in public service as a civil rights attorney at the Department of Justice. She went on to lead the White House Initiative for Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders and then serve as the Chief of Staff for OPM as it responded to a data breach that exposed the personal information of millions of Federal employees and contractors.

Kiran Ahuja will be tasked with leading OPM as it faces a new set of challenges. After 4 years of attacks by the Trump administration on the protections at the core of our merit-based civil service system, OPM needs a leader who understands that Federal workers serve our country, not the individual or political party currently occupying the White House.

OPM is an independent Federal agency tasked with a vital mission: ensuring that the Federal workforce delivers top-notch service to the American people. The next OPM Director must recognize, as President Biden and Mrs. Ahuja do, that union organizing and collective bargaining are in the public interest and that these rights are vital safeguards to protect the merit system principles of the civil service. The next OPM Director must also work to attract new talent to Federal agencies that have lost valuable expertise and modernize OPM's outdated information technology systems. I am confident that Mrs. Ahuja has the skills and knowledge to meet these challenges and to carry out the agency's mission.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO MAL LEARY

• Mr. KING. Mr. President, I rise today to honor a Maine legend who will soon

be leaving his post after nearly a half century of diligent, inquisitive journalism that has kept our State's citizens better informed. At the beginning of July, Mal Leary will sign off for the final time from Maine Public Broadcasting, concluding a 45-year career during which he became one of the most trusted voices in Maine media.

When listeners heard Mal's distinctive Maine rasp come across the airwaves, they knew they were getting the straight news from a model journalist. His integrity and intelligence came through in every story, diving into the policy details in a measured, well-reasoned way that did not betray a bias toward any ideology, political party, or elected officials. Most importantly, every time you finished listening to a Mal story, you knew more about your community and your State than you did just a few moments before.

Mal wasn't only held in high esteem by listeners. I can tell you from personal experience that when Mal is in a room, elected officials notice his presence. He loomed large among the Maine press corps, and his ability to unravel and explain a complicated policy question was only matched by his political instincts. While others, including legislators, were focused on the questions of the day, Mal would look two or three steps down the road to anticipate the pitfalls facing any given proposal. I learned quickly that I always needed to have my facts straight before I talked to Mal Leary.

His innate understanding of both policy and policymakers made Mal's interviews one-of-a-kind. I would often start a conversation with him, expecting to discuss the issues of the day, only to be questioned on an issue that wouldn't come up for another few months or review a legislative hearing from 3 weeks prior. Refusing to be a prisoner of the moment, he always looked at the big picture, and, critically, he made sure that the elected officials he covered did the same.

Maine will be poorer without Mal Leary roaming the State capitol, but he is leaving the Maine press corps in good hands that he had a part in training. A fountain of institutional knowledge, Mal was always generous with his time and his experience, filling in young reporters on the historical context behind long-gestating problems or making sure folks were up to speed on legislative procedures. This next generation of reporters have each grown by absorbing Mal's wisdom, working to compete with him, or a combination of the two, so although he may be leaving for greener pastures, his lessons and influence will remain.

I find a bit of irony in these remarks because even as I attempt to honor Mal, I sense that he will have some discomfort taking the compliment. The definition of a model reporter, Mal wasn't focused on befriending his subjects or accumulating personal accolades; he was always dead set on getting to the truth and bringing that

truth back to the people of Maine. That is why he is so beloved by all—OK, by most—even when he was asking hard questions; at the end of the day, Mal always told the story straight. He was always fair.

I have long believed that journalists are people we, the public, hire to tell us about priorities that we don't have time to attend to ourselves; instead, we rely on friends to give us the scoop. That is exactly who Mal was for thousands across Maine—a friend, who filled them in on the latest goings-on in Augusta, Washington, and everywhere in between. As our friend rides off into the beautiful sunsets of Maine, I want to express to him my best wishes and Maine's enormous gratitude for his work to make our State better.●

TRIBUTE TO ISAIAH LEE

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Isaiah Lee, an intern in my Rapid City, SD, office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several weeks.

Isaiah is a graduate of Roosevelt High School in Sioux Falls, SD. Currently, he is attending Northwestern College in Orange City, IA, where he is majoring in political science. He is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Isaiah for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

NOTICE OF INTENT TO OBJECT TO PROCEEDING FROM JUNE 22, 2021

I, Senator CHARLES E. GRASSLEY, intend to object to proceeding to the nomination of Kenneth Allen Polite, Jr., of Louisiana, to be Assistant Attorney General, dated June 22, 2021.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Ridgway, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

In executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:03 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Alli, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 983. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide an additional tool to prevent certain frauds against veterans, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1374. An act to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to provide Federal financial assistance to States to implement, review, and revise State energy security plans, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 983. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide an additional tool to prevent certain frauds against veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1374. An act to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to provide Federal financial assistance to States to implement, review, and revise State energy security plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BARRASSO:

S. 2185. A bill to reauthorize certain Bureau of Reclamation programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. SMITH, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 2186. A bill to support educational entities in fully implementing title IX and reducing and preventing sex discrimination in all areas of education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. KAINE, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. PADILLA, and Mr. LUJÁN):

S. 2187. A bill to establish the "Biomedical Innovation Fund", and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 2188. A bill to establish the Commission to Study the Stigmatization, Criminalization, and Ongoing Exclusion and Inequity for LGBTQ Servicemembers and Veterans; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TUBERVILLE (for himself, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. HOEVEN):

S. 2189. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish hyperbaric oxygen therapy to certain veterans with traumatic brain injury or post-traumatic stress disorder; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Mr. KING, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. TESTER):

S. 2190. A bill to establish the Task Force on the Impact of the Affordable Housing Crisis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 2191. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude certain post-graduation scholarship grants from gross income in the same manner as qualified scholarships to promote economic growth; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. PADILLA, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 2192. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to require that supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits be calculated using the value of the low-cost food plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. BRAUN (for himself and Mr. BURR):

S. 2193. A bill to ensure that an employment relationship is not established between a franchisor and a franchisee if the franchisor engages in certain activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. GRAHAM):

S. 2194. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, through the Coastal Program of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, to work with willing partners and provide support to efforts to assess, protect, restore, and enhance important coastal areas that provide fish and wildlife habitat on which Federal trust species depend, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. HIRONO:

S. 2195. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make all fact sheets of the Department of Veterans Affairs available in English, Spanish, and Tagalog, and other commonly spoken languages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DAINES:

S. 2196. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to expand the list of categories of essential travel into the United States at land ports of entry along the United States-Canada border, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TESTER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. LUJÁN, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 2197. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to increase the Federal medical assistance percentage for States that provide Medicaid coverage for telehealth services; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 2198. A bill to amend the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 to give the Department of Education the authority to award competitive grants to eligible entities to establish, expand, or support school-based mentoring programs to assist at-risk students in middle school and high school in developing cognitive and social-emotional skills to prepare them for success in high school, postsecondary education, and the workforce; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. KING, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 2199. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish a voluntary Cyber Sense program to test the cybersecurity of products and technologies intended for use in the bulk-power system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. HEINRICH:

S. 2200. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish a research, development, demonstration, and deployment program to improve the efficiency, increase the durability, and reduce the cost of producing hydrogen using electrolyzers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON):

S. 2201. A bill to manage supply chain risk through counterintelligence training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. MARSHALL):

S. 2202. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income interest received on certain loans secured by agricultural real property; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. COONS, Mr. KAINE, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNOCK, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. SMITH, Mr. BROWN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. SCHATZ, and Mr. REED):

S. Res. 283. A resolution reaffirming the importance of the United States to promoting the safety, health, and well-being of refugees and displaced persons; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 65

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) and the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) were added as cosponsors of S. 65, a bill to ensure that goods made with forced labor in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region of the People's Republic of China do not enter the United States market, and for other purposes.

S. 79

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 79, a bill to eliminate the disparity in sentencing for cocaine offenses, and for other purposes.

S. 247

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 247, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide compensatory time for employees in the private sector.

S. 576

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 576, a bill to amend title 14, United States Code, to require the Coast Guard to conduct icebreaking operations in the Great Lakes to mini-

mize commercial disruption in the winter months, and for other purposes.

S. 659

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 659, a bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to promulgate regulations relating to commercial motor vehicle drivers under the age of 21, and for other purposes.

S. 692

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HICKENLOOPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 692, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the female telephone operators of the Army Signal Corps, known as the "Hello Girls".

S. 697

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 697, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint commemorative coins in recognition of the Bicentennial of Harriet Tubman's birth.

S. 699

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 699, a bill to require a review of women and lung cancer, and for other purposes.

S. 796

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 796, a bill to codify maternity care coordination programs at the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 870

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 870, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to mental health services under the Medicare program.

S. 1021

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1021, a bill to ensure affordable abortion coverage and care for every person, and for other purposes.

S. 1106

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1106, a bill to prohibit the sale of shark fins, and for other purposes.

S. 1125

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1125, a bill to recommend that the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Innovation test the effect of a dementia care management model, and for other purposes.

S. 1251

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, the names of the Senator from Arizona

(Ms. SINEMA), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1251, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to develop a program to reduce barriers to entry for farmers, ranchers, and private forest landowners in certain voluntary markets, and for other purposes.

S. 1396

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1396, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish State and Indian Tribe grants for community colleges and grants for Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Tribal Colleges and Universities, and Minority-Serving Institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 1543

At the request of Ms. HASSAN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1543, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide best practices on student suicide awareness and prevention training and condition State educational agencies, local educational agencies, and tribal educational agencies receiving funds under section 520A of such Act to establish and implement a school-based student suicide awareness and prevention training policy.

S. 1806

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1806, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend tax incentives for biodiesel and renewable diesel.

S. 1820

At the request of Mr. COONS, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1820, a bill to increase the number of landlords participating in the Housing Choice Voucher program.

S. 1872

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1872, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States Army Rangers Veterans of World War II in recognition of their extraordinary service during World War II.

S. 1930

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1930, a bill to amend the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act of 1996 to clarify that citizens of the

Federated States of Micronesia, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and the Republic of Palau who are lawfully residing in the United States are eligible for certain Federal public benefits.

S. 1990

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of Florida, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1990, a bill to establish processes to control inflationary pressures and the Federal debt, during Federal debt emergencies.

S. 2011

At the request of Mr. COONS, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2011, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to honor the contributions of all those whose efforts led to the successful development of life saving vaccines to combat the novel coronavirus.

S. 2037

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2037, a bill to amend title XVIII to strengthen ambulance services furnished under part B of the Medicare program.

S. 2065

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2065, a bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to update eligibility for the supplemental security income program, and for other purposes.

S. 2081

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine) were added as cosponsors of S. 2081, a bill to improve the structure of the Federal Pell Grant program, and for other purposes.

S. 2166

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2166, a bill to provide that certain orders of the Federal Communications Commission shall have no force or effect until certain conditions are satisfied, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 10

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HICKENLOOPER) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 10, a joint resolution to repeal the authorizations for use of military force against Iraq, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 220

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER)

were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 220, a resolution calling upon the United States Senate to give its advice and consent to the ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 2198. A bill to amend the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 to give the Department of Education the authority to award competitive grants to eligible entities to establish, expand, or support school-based mentoring programs to assist at-risk students in middle school and high school in developing cognitive and social-emotional skills to prepare them for success in high school, postsecondary education, and the workforce; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2198

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Mentoring to Succeed Act of 2021”.

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act is to make assistance available for school-based mentoring programs for at-risk students in order to—

- (1) establish, expand, or support school-based mentoring programs;
- (2) assist at-risk students in middle school and high school in developing cognitive and social-emotional skills; and
- (3) prepare such at-risk students for success in high school, postsecondary education, and the workforce.

SEC. 3. SCHOOL-BASED MENTORING PROGRAM.

Part C of title I of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2351 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 136. DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS FOR SCHOOL-BASED MENTORING PROGRAMS.

- “(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:
- “(1) AT-RISK STUDENT.—The term ‘at-risk student’ means a student who—
- “(A) is failing academically or at risk of dropping out of school;
- “(B) is pregnant or a parent;
- “(C) is a gang member;
- “(D) is a child or youth in foster care or a youth who has been emancipated from foster care, but is still enrolled in high school;
- “(E) is or has recently been a homeless child or youth;
- “(F) is chronically absent;
- “(G) has changed schools 3 or more times in the past 6 months;
- “(H) has come in contact with the juvenile justice system in the past;
- “(I) has a history of multiple suspensions or disciplinary actions;
- “(J) is an English learner;
- “(K) has one or both parents incarcerated;
- “(L) has experienced one or more adverse childhood experiences, traumatic events, or

toxic stressors, as assessed through an evidence-based screening;

“(M) lives in a high-poverty area with a high rate of community violence;

“(N) has a disability; or

“(O) shows signs of alcohol or drug misuse or abuse or has a parent or guardian who is struggling with substance abuse.

“(2) DISABILITY.—The term ‘disability’ has the meaning given the term for purposes of section 602(3) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1401(3)).

“(3) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term ‘eligible entity’—

“(A) means a high-need local educational agency, high-need school, or local government entity; and

“(B) may include a partnership between an entity described in subparagraph (A) and a nonprofit, community-based, or faith-based organization, or institution of higher education.

“(4) ENGLISH LEARNER.—The term ‘English learner’ has the meaning given the term in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

“(5) FOSTER CARE.—The term ‘foster care’ has the meaning given the term in section 1355.20 of title 45, Code of Federal Regulations.

“(6) HIGH-NEED LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY.—The term ‘high-need local educational agency’ means a local educational agency that serves at least one high-need school.

“(7) HIGH-NEED SCHOOL.—The term ‘high-need school’ has the meaning given the term in section 2211(b) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6631(b)).

“(8) HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS.—The term ‘homeless children and youths’ has the meaning given the term in section 725 of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11434a).

“(9) SCHOOL-BASED MENTORING.—The term ‘school-based mentoring’ means a structured, managed, evidenced-based program conducted in partnership with teachers, administrators, school psychologists, school social workers or counselors, and other school staff, in which at-risk students are appropriately matched with screened and trained professional or volunteer mentors who provide guidance, support, and encouragement, involving meetings, group-based sessions, and educational and workforce-related activities on a regular basis to prepare at-risk students for success in high school, postsecondary education, and the workforce.

“(b) SCHOOL-BASED MENTORING COMPETITIVE GRANT PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall award grants on a competitive basis to eligible entities to establish, expand, or support school-based mentoring programs that—

“(A) are designed to assist at-risk students in high-need schools in developing cognitive skills and promoting social-emotional learning to prepare them for success in high school, postsecondary education, and the workforce by linking them with mentors who—

“(i) have received mentor training, including on trauma-informed practices, youth engagement, cultural competency, and social-emotional learning; and

“(ii) have been screened using appropriate reference checks and criminal background checks;

“(B) provide coaching and technical assistance to mentors in each such mentoring program;

“(C) seek to—

“(i) improve the academic achievement of at-risk students;

“(ii) reduce dropout rates and absenteeism and improve school engagement of at-risk students and their families;

“(iii) reduce juvenile justice involvement of at-risk students;

“(iv) foster positive relationships between at-risk students and their peers, teachers, other adults, and family members;

“(v) develop the workforce readiness skills of at-risk students by exploring paths to employment, including encouraging students with disabilities to explore transition services; and

“(vi) increase the participation of at-risk students in community service activities; and

“(D) encourage at-risk students to set goals and plan for their futures, including making plans and identifying goals for postsecondary education and the workforce.

“(2) DURATION.—The Secretary shall award grants under this section for a period not to exceed 5 years.

“(3) APPLICATION.—To receive a grant under this section, an eligible entity shall submit to the Secretary an application that includes—

“(A) a needs assessment that includes baseline data on the measures described in paragraph (6)(A)(ii); and

“(B) a plan to meet the requirements of paragraph (1).

“(4) PRIORITY.—In selecting grant recipients, the Secretary shall give priority to applicants that—

“(A) serve children and youth with the greatest need living in high-poverty, high-crime areas, or rural areas, or who attend schools with high rates of community violence;

“(B) provide at-risk students with opportunities for postsecondary education preparation and career development, including—

“(i) job training, professional development, work shadowing, internships, networking, resume writing and review, interview preparation, transition services for students with disabilities, application assistance and visits to institutions of higher education, and leadership development through community service; and

“(ii) partnerships with the private sector and local businesses to provide internship and career exploration activities and resources; and

“(C) seek to provide match lengths between at-risk students and mentors for at least 1 academic year.

“(5) USE OF FUNDS.—An eligible entity that receives a grant under this section may use such funds to—

“(A) develop and carry out regular training for mentors, including on—

“(i) the impact of adverse childhood experiences;

“(ii) trauma-informed practices and interventions;

“(iii) supporting homeless children and youths;

“(iv) supporting children and youth in foster care or youth who have been emancipated from foster care, but are still enrolled in high school;

“(v) cultural competency;

“(vi) meeting all appropriate privacy and confidentiality requirements for students, including students in foster care;

“(vii) working in coordination with a public school system;

“(viii) positive youth development and engagement practices; and

“(ix) disability inclusion practices to ensure access and participation by students with disabilities;

“(B) recruit, screen, match, and train mentors;

“(C) hire staff to perform or support the objectives of the school-based mentoring program;

“(D) provide inclusive and accessible youth engagement activities, such as—

“(i) enrichment field trips to cultural destinations; and

“(ii) career awareness activities, including job site visits, informational interviews, resume writing, interview preparation, and networking; and

“(iii) academic or postsecondary education preparation activities, including trade or vocational school visits, visits to institutions of higher education, and assistance in applying to institutions of higher education; and

“(E) conduct program evaluation, including by acquiring and analyzing the data described under paragraph (6).

“(6) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 6 months after the end of each academic year during the grant period, an eligible entity receiving a grant under this section shall submit to the Secretary a report that includes—

“(i) the number of students who participated in the school-based mentoring program that was funded in whole or in part with the grant funds;

“(ii) data on the academic achievement, dropout rates, truancy, absenteeism, outcomes of arrests for violent crime, summer employment, and postsecondary education enrollment of students in the program;

“(iii) the number of group sessions and number of one-to-one contacts between students in the program and their mentors;

“(iv) the average attendance of students enrolled in the program;

“(v) the number of students with disabilities connected to transition services;

“(vi) data on social-emotional development of students as assessed with a validated social-emotional assessment tool; and

“(vii) any other information that the Secretary may require to evaluate the success of the school-based mentoring program.

“(B) STUDENT PRIVACY.—An eligible entity shall ensure that the report submitted under subparagraph (A) is prepared in a manner that protects the privacy rights of each student in accordance with section 444 of the General Education Provisions Act (commonly referred to as the ‘Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974’) (20 U.S.C. 1232g).

“(7) MENTORING RESOURCES AND COMMUNITY SERVICE COORDINATION.—

“(A) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall work with the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention to—

“(i) refer grantees under this section to the National Mentoring Resource Center to obtain resources on best practices and research related to mentoring and to request no-cost training and technical assistance; and

“(ii) provide grantees under this section with information regarding transitional services for at-risk students returning from correctional facilities and transition services for students with disabilities.

“(B) COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall, to the extent possible, coordinate with the Corporation for National and Community Service, including through entering into an interagency agreement or a memorandum of understanding, to support mentoring and community service-related activities for at-risk students.

“(C) AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2027.”

SEC. 4. INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION SCIENCES STUDY ON SCHOOL-BASED MENTORING PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Education, acting through the Director of the Institute of Education Sciences, shall conduct a study to—

(1) identify successful school-based mentoring programs and effective strategies for

administering and monitoring such programs;

(2) evaluate the role of mentors in promoting cognitive development and social-emotional learning to enhance academic achievement and to improve workforce readiness; and

(3) evaluate the effectiveness of the grant program under section 136 of the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006, as added by section 3, on student academic outcomes and youth career development.

(b) TIMING.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Education, acting through the Director of the Institute of Education Sciences, shall submit the results of the study to the appropriate congressional committees.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 283—RE-AFFIRMING THE IMPORTANCE OF THE UNITED STATES TO PROMOTING THE SAFETY, HEALTH, AND WELL-BEING OF REFUGEES AND DISPLACED PERSONS

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. COONS, Mr. KAINE, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNOCK, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. SMITH, Mr. BROWN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. SCHATZ, and Mr. REED) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 283

Whereas June 20 is observed as “World Refugee Day”, a global event to acknowledge the courage, resilience, and determination of individuals and families who are forced to flee their homes due to persecution;

Whereas December 14, 2020, signified 70 years since the founding of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees;

Whereas July 28, 2021, is the 70th anniversary of the Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees, signed in Geneva on July 28, 1951, which defines the term “refugee” and outlines the rights of refugees and the legal obligations of states to protect them;

Whereas, in 2020, according to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees—

(1) there were more than 82,400,000 forcibly displaced people worldwide, the worst displacement crisis in recorded history, including 26,400,000 refugees, more than 48,000,000 internally displaced people, and 4,100,000 people seeking asylum;

(2) on average, 1 out of every 95 people worldwide was a refugee, an internally displaced person, or a person seeking asylum;

(3) 11,200,000 people were newly displaced due to recent conflict or persecution;

(4) 68 percent of the world’s refugees came from Syria, Venezuela, Afghanistan, South Sudan, and Burma;

(5) 2,600,000 Afghan refugees were displaced worldwide, making them one of the world’s largest and longest-running displaced populations;

(6) more than 50 percent of the population of Syria, at least 13,500,000 people, were displaced, either across the international border or within Syria, which represents the largest displacement crisis in the world today;

(7) children accounted for 30 percent of the world's population but 42 percent of all forcibly displaced people, millions of whom were unable to access basic services, including education; and

(8) 86 percent of all refugees were hosted by developing nations, and less than 1 percent of vulnerable refugees in need of resettlement had the opportunity to resettle because sufficient numbers of places do not exist;

Whereas refugees are major contributors to local economies and served as critical frontline health professionals and essential workers combating the COVID-19 pandemic worldwide;

Whereas the United States has an obligation to provide humanitarian protection to refugees, as well as interpreters, translators, and others in Afghanistan who served alongside United States and NATO troops, diplomats, and development workers;

Whereas the United States supports the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to increase protection for LGBTQI+ refugees overseas and to support global resettlement of LGBTQI+ refugees; and

Whereas the United States Refugee Admissions Program, which was established over 40 years ago, is a lifesaving solution crucial to global humanitarian efforts, strengthens global security, advances United States foreign policy goals, supports regional host countries, and assists individuals and families in need: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) reaffirms the bipartisan commitment of the United States to promote the safety, health, and well-being of millions of refugees, including the education of refugee children and displaced persons, who flee war, persecution, or torture in search of peace, hope, and freedom;

(2) recognizes those individuals who have risked their lives working, either individually or for nongovernmental organizations and international agencies, such as the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, to provide lifesaving assistance and protection for people displaced around the world;

(3) underscores the importance of the United States Refugee Admissions Program as a critical tool for the United States Government to strengthen national and regional security and encourage international solidarity with host countries;

(4) calls upon the Secretary of State and United States Ambassador to the United Nations to—

(A) continue providing robust funding for refugee protection overseas and resettlement in the United States;

(B) uphold the United States international leadership role in responding to displacement crises with humanitarian assistance, and restore its leadership role in the protection of vulnerable refugee populations that endure sexual violence, human trafficking, persecution and violence against religious minorities, forced conscription, genocide, and exploitation;

(C) work in partnership with the international community to find solutions to existing conflicts and prevent new conflicts from beginning;

(D) continue supporting the efforts of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to advance the work of nongovernmental organizations to protect refugees regardless of their country of origin or religious beliefs;

(E) continue to alleviate pressures on frontline refugee host countries that absorb the majority of the world's refugees through humanitarian and development support; and

(F) respond to the global refugee crisis by meeting robust refugee admissions goals; and

(5) reaffirms the goals of "World Refugee Day" and reiterates the strong commitment of the United States to protect the millions of refugees who live without material, social, or legal protections.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, I have 8 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

The Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 23, 2021, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 23, 2021, at 3 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 23, 2021, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 23, 2021, at 3 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 22, 2021, at 2 p.m., to conduct a closed hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CYBERSECURITY

The Subcommittee on Cybersecurity of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 23, 2021, at 2 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ENERGY

The Subcommittee on Energy of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 23, 2021, at 2 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC POLICY

The Subcommittee on Economic Policy of the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 23, 2021, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 24, 2021

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Thursday, June 24;

that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; that upon the conclusion of morning business, the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 1251, the Growing Climate Solutions Act, under the previous order; further, that all time on the bill expire at 11 a.m.; that there be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to each vote, with all provisions of the order remaining in effect; that upon disposition of S. 1251, the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Jackson-Akiwumi nomination, with all postcloture time expiring at 1:45 p.m.; finally, that if the nomination is confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, for the information of Senators, there will be two rollcall votes starting at 11 a.m. and one vote at 1:45 p.m.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MURPHY. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator MARSHALL and Senator BROWN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MARSHALL. I ask unanimous consent to use two scientific models as props during my speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CORONAVIRUS

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, it seems like every week, we get a new update on the timeline for the origin of the COVID-19 virus. This week, we learned that in October of 2019—October 2019—that over 1,000 soldiers from over 100 countries had gathered in Wuhan, China, for a military Olympics, if you will.

Then what we learned is that, several weeks after that event, many of our own athletes and our own military personnel became ill, as well as folks from other countries. We went back further and talked to some of those soldiers. They told us that Wuhan, China, looked like a ghost town during that event. A town of over 11 million people looked like a ghost town.

What I am frustrated about is that the CDC has not investigated this, that the military has not investigated it, and that, during the proper times, we could have tested their antibodies. When we learned of this, maybe, perhaps, in March or in April, they probably still had antibodies. Even today, we could investigate it, but we need

the FDA to do its job as well. We need the FDA to pass a T-cell test so we can go back and see if these soldiers who became ill after this event—to see if, indeed, this was from the COVID-19 virus.

Certainly, the timeline, by all accounts, is going backward every month, but I think it is time to update the American public, too, on what I feel are the lab origins of this virus. Certainly, this is just a theory, but I think we need to look into and discover and talk more about the biological origin of this virus.

This is a model of COVID-19, the virus that has killed millions of people across the world. It looks very much like the original SARS virus, with an exception, and that exception is a protein spike. The protein spike that I am talking about is composed of two units. We will call those two units S-1 and S-2, and this is a model of that COVID-19 protein spike. It is very special. It is very unique.

Let's talk about the S-1 spike just for a second. The S-1 spike looks very similar—it looks exactly like viral gain-of-function research that was conducted between a lab in North Carolina and with Dr. Shi, the “bat lady” from the Wuhan Institute of Virology. That S-1 spike sticks to lung cells like glue. Again, this is NIH-funded research, the North Carolina lab, and the Wuhan Institute of Virology.

What we did is we took the basic, original SARS virus, and we slapped a protein spike on it that made it stick to human cells like glue. Think of it as being like a key in a lock. Think about, if you have a human cell as the lock, that there needs to be a special key. So they invented a special key that would impact and go into only human cells. That was done in about 2015, but then, after that, things go dark. We don't know what happened, but, somehow, this COVID-19 virus has another part of this protein spike, and we will call it the S-2 unit.

The theory is that, in the Wuhan Institute of Virology and, possibly, in the Wuhan CDC Lab, further research was done. They developed a special part of this spike—again, the S-2 unit. This is what is so special about it: It has what we call a furin cleavage site. The furin cleavage site is—and don't take it from me; take it from Nobel Laureate Dr. David Baltimore.

Dr. Baltimore said that the furin cleavage site with its double arginine codon—and I am paraphrasing here—is the smoking gun for the lab origin of the virus in that this double arginine codon just doesn't occur in nature and that only human cells have the ability to use that furin cleavage site and break this into two separate units. That is what allows this virus to dump its genetic material into human lung cells and replicate.

As a physician, as a person who has studied virology a bit, this protein spike just doesn't look like it comes from nature. Everything about it

would suggest that it was made in a laboratory. It is just too mean. It is too angry. It is just too perfect. It is too infectious. The unique thing about it is, though some would make us believe that this virus comes from bats, this virus doesn't like bats.

It only took American scientists and Chinese scientists 4 months to discover the origin of the original SARS virus, that it came from a bat and then it went to another animal, an intermediate host. It only took us 4 months to discover that virus. The MERS virus, on the other hand, it took us about 9 months. Here we are 18 months later, and we don't have any type of an intermediate host. All of the mapping that we are seeing points to this virus being made in a laboratory.

Now, the Wuhan lab could disprove me. They have the data to prove me wrong, but I am afraid that the data is now gone. It is gone forever—most likely destroyed—unless, of course, we can find it in a cloud somewhere.

It is outrageous that a comprehensive investigation on the origins of COVID-19 has still not been carried out. Now, I am proud that this body passed a resolution that Senator GILLIBRAND and I put together that calls for a transparent investigation of the COVID-19 outbreak, mandated by the World Health Assembly. It unanimously passed this body, and that resolution demands a full and transparent investigation to include the United States and our allies and our partners around the world.

Now, it is time for the Senate to do our job. It is time for the Senate to fully investigate the origins of this virus as well. It would be utterly irresponsible to suffer through the worst pandemic in a century and not have the origins fully investigated.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

REMEMBERING JAMES TIMOTHY “MUDCAT” GRANT, JR.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, last week, America lost a baseball legend, a pioneer in civil rights, Jim “Mudcat” Grant.

He joined the Cleveland Indians in 1958. He spent 14 years in the Major Leagues. I remember watching him play when I was a kid growing up in Cleveland in the 1960s.

Cleveland has been, more than any other franchise, perhaps, a pioneer for change in baseball. Cleveland had the first Black player in the American League, Larry Doby, Hall of Famer. He came into the league only about 2 months after Jackie Robinson integrated the National League. Cleveland had the first Black manager, Hall of Famer Frank Robinson. Cleveland also had “Mudcat” Grant, who refused to be silent in the face of segregated hotels and racist slurs and discrimination from management.

Grant was an accomplished singer with a beautiful voice. He organized

the singing group “Mudcat and the Kitchens” to make up the income he was denied that other players had, that White players had, in advertising and endorsements. Companies wouldn't hire a Black player. They toured the country during the off-season, performing with Johnny Carson and in places a little less known.

I remember Grant in later years serving as an announcer for Cleveland Indian games with a southern drawl that was unmistakable.

He didn't just use that voice, though, for entertainment or commentating on plays; he used it to speak out for civil rights.

During the national anthem at one game, predating Colin Kaepernick, Mudcat Grant—in the 1960s, before civil rights and voting rights had passed this Congress, he said this during the national anthem. He said:

This land is not free. I can't even go to Mississippi and sit down at a lunch counter.

A Major League Baseball player.

In 1958, he and his White teammate Gary Bell roomed together for away games, becoming the first time—players, in those days, when they were paid less than management, charged less, whatever, players roomed together. Two players would room together. Gary Bell and Mudcat Grant were the first Black and White roommates in the major leagues in 1958.

While running for President, Senator John F. Kennedy invited Mudcat Grant to breakfast. Grant didn't hold back. He talked openly with Senator Kennedy, with the future President, about the poverty he grew up in, the racism he endured every day—this was 1960—as a Major League Baseball player.

Of course, it wasn't only his activism we remember Mudcat Grant for. We know his talent on the field. He was Minor League's Rookie of the Year in 1954, only 7 years after baseball was integrated.

In 1965, he was the first Black player to win 20 games in the American League. He should have been the first, but listen to this: For years, major league managers conspired to prevent Black pitchers from becoming 20-game winners. That almost doesn't make sense.

Well, Grant said some catchers would tell the hitters, the opposing hitters, while they were catching, what was coming because they didn't want you to do well as a pitcher.

Other managers, when a player was reaching—a pitcher was getting close to 20 games, other managers sat the player down so he couldn't win 20 games as a Black man.

After Black players pass away, we often hear about how they were among the underappreciated talents of the game. That is not a coincidence. In addition to being a singer, Grant was also a writer. He published a book in 2007 called “The Black Aces.” It is about the great African-American pitchers. Part of his project is to tell more stories about Black players and to teach

more people about the history of baseball integration.

It is the kind of stories we need to tell more often. Our country is richer, as the Presiding Officer representing Arizona knows—the country is richer when we tell people's stories.

Let's honor James Timothy Grant, Jr., by telling his story, by heeding his words. In his great poem "Life," James Timothy Grant Jr. wrote:

Life is like a game of baseball, you play it every day. It isn't just the breaks you get, but the kind of game you play.

James "Mudcat" Grant, rest in peace.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:48 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, June 24, 2021, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

KATHLEEN S. MILLER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE. (NEW POSITION)
CELESTE ANN WALLANDER, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, VICE ROBERT STORY KAREM.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

DAVID M. UHLMANN, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, VICE SUSAN PARKER BODINE.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

SHARON L. CROMER, OF NEW YORK, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE GAMBIA.

TROY DAMIAN FITRELL, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF GUINEA.

MARC OSTFIELD, OF PENNSYLVANIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF PARAGUAY.

KENNETH LEE SALAZAR, OF COLORADO, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE UNITED MEXICAN STATES.

JULIANNE SMITH, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE UNITED STATES PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE ON THE COUNCIL OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION, WITH THE RANK AND STATUS OF AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY.

C.B. SULLENBERGER III, OF TEXAS, FOR THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR DURING HIS TENURE OF SERVICE AS REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ON THE COUNCIL OF THE INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION.

CYNTHIA ANN TELLES, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF COSTA RICA.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

DAVID M. PROUTY, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD FOR THE TERM OF FIVE YEARS EXPIRING AUGUST 27, 2026, VICE WILLIAM J. EMANUEL, TERM EXPIRING.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

GUY T. KIYOKAWA, OF HAWAII, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS (ENTERPRISE INTEGRATION), VICE MELISSA SUE GLYNN, RESIGNED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

LT. GEN. ANTHONY J. COTTON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COL. RICHARD G. ADAMS

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. CHRISTOPHER J. MAHONEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. STEPHEN D. SKLENKA

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 23, 2021:

THE JUDICIARY

DEBORAH L. BOARDMAN, OF MARYLAND, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

ROBIN CARNAHAN, OF MISSOURI, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF GENERAL SERVICES.